UNIV. OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/monthlyrepositor08londuoft

LE
M

THE

MONTHLY REPOSITORY

OF

THEOLOGY

AND

GENERAL LITERATURE.

———POPULUMQUE FALSIS
DEDOCET UTI
VOCIBUS. *Hor.*

"To do something to instruct, but more to undeceive, the timid and admiring student;—to excite him to place more confidence in his own strength, and less in the infallibility of great names.—to help him to emancipate his judgment from the shackles of authority:—to teach him to distinguish between shewy language and sound sense:—to warn him not to pay himself with words:—to shew him, that what may tickle the ear or dazzle the imagination, will not always inform the judgment:—to dispose him rather to fast on ignorance than to feed himself with error."

Fragment on Government.

JANUARY TO DECEMBER INCLUSIVE.

1813.

VOLUME VIII.

313523
3
35
22

HACKNEY:
Printed for the Editor, by C. Stower;
PUBLISHED BY SHERWOOD, NEELY AND JONES,
PATERNOSTER ROW.
1813.

Aaron Cooley Moore

PREFACE.

A Preface is scarcely necessary to the completeness of a Volume of a Monthly Periodical Work, and cannot be continued from year to year with both pertinence and variety: but we cannot dismiss from under our care the present Volume of a Magazine devoted to Theological Inquiry and Discussion, without congratulating our readers on the triumph which the present year has obtained over bigotry and intolerance, in the Act of Parliament for the relief of Unitarians from penalties, on account of the avowal of their faith. We hail it as an earnest of the emancipation of Christianity from the ignominious domination of human law; and pray that those whom it particularly affects may consider it as both a call to religious zeal and exertion, and a motive to praise of the Divine Goodness.

Dec. 30, 1813.

THE

MONTHLY REPOSITORY

OF

Theology and General Literature.

No. LXXXV. JANUARY. [Vol. VIII.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

Historical Account of the Warrington Academy.

Newcastle, Dec. 20, 1812.

Sir,

I now at length enter on the fulfilment of my promise (M. Repos. vol. v. p. 429.) to furnish you with some account of the Warrington Academy, from its first establishment in 1757, to its dissolution in 1783. If I had been aware of the difficulties which I should have had to encounter in clearing up various circumstances connected with its early history, I might not, perhaps, have been so forward in offering my services, to pay the best tribute in my power to the memory of my *alma mater*. But when it is considered that more than half a century has elapsed, since many important particulars connected with its history occurred, that all the persons engaged in its direction have, for several years, been dead, and that very few remain of those who were students during its more early periods, your readers, I trust, will excuse any imperfections which may appear in the following historical sketch.

The period between the years 1750 and 1754, was experienced by the Protestant Dissenters, in the North of England, more especially, as particularly critical in respect to their interests as a religious body, which had, from the first separation of the Nonconformists from the Church of England, been served by ministers respectable both for character and learning. The race of ministers who had been bred in the seminaries of Frankland, Sheffield, Benyon, Coningham, Dixon, Jollie, Owen, were fast retiring from the stage, while the failure, one after another, of the academical institutions which had succeeded those above-enumerated, and on which the northern congregations had rested their dependance for the supply of vacancies as they occurred, created a general and reasonable alarm. Dr. Doddridge's death, in 1750, had caused a removal of the Northampton academy to Daventry, where the talents of the new tutor, Dr. Ashworth, were not, as yet at least, appreciated as they probably deserved: the death of Dr. Rotheram, in 1751, had been followed (as has been seen, vol. v. p. 218) by the entire dissolution of the academy at Kendal, and that of Dr. Latham, at Findern, near Derby, in 1754, brought to a close an institution to which the Protestant Dissenters had been indebted for a considerable proportion of their most respectable ministers.

In this alarming state of the dissenting interest in the North of England, the public-spirited activity of Mr. John Seddon, then a young and highly popular minister at Warrington (see M. R. vol. v. p. 428.) succeeded in stimulating the principal merchants and others in Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Warrington and other places, to attempt the establishment of an academical institution, which should "unite as far as was possible, the advantages of the public and more private method of education;" should be calculated at once, for the education of ministers, on the principle of their being "free to follow the dictates of their own judgments, in their enquiries after truth, without any undue bias imposed on their understandings;" and, at the same time, "to give some knowledge to those who were to be engaged in commercial life, as well as in the learned professions, in the more useful branches of literature, and to lead them to an early acquaintance with, and just concern for the true principles of religion and liberty, of which principles they must, in future life, be the supporters."—Accordingly, the annual sum of 217*l.* having been engaged for, through Mr. Seddon's instigation chiefly, at the above-mentioned four places, proposals were circulated from Manchester, by nine of the principal Dissenters there, "for establishing a public academy, in or near Warrington, to be under the management of a President, Vice-President, Treasurer, Secretary, and Committee of twelve, who should elect tutors, of known ability and good character, in theology, moral philosophy, including logic and metaphysics, natural philosophy, including the mathematics, and in the languages and polite literature; form a proper system of rules and orders for the government and discipline of the students; and to conduct the institution, though intended to be open to all persons, with a particular view to the encouragement of young persons designed for the ministry, especially to such as may want assistance to defray the expense of their education."

On the 30th of June, 1757, the first General Meeting of Subscribers (the subscriptions amounting to 469*l.* annually) was held at Warrington; when the Right Hon. Hugh Lord Willoughby of Parham, was elected President, John Lees, Esq. of Manchester, Vice-president, Arthur Heywood, Esq. of Liverpool, Treasurer, and the Rev. John Seddon, of Warrington, Secretary; and the Rev. John Taylor, D. D. of Norwich, was elected Tutor in Divinity, the Rev. John Holt, of Kirkdale, near Liverpool, Tutor, in the Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, and Mr. Samuel Dyer, of London, Tutor in the Languages and Belles Lettres; at a salary of 100*l.* to each, besides a fee of 2*l.* 2*s.* from the several students who should attend their respective Lectures; except the divinity students on the foundation, who were exempted from paying any fees.

Dr. Taylor, whose great merits as a scriptural theologian are known and acknowledged, even by his keenest adversaries, accepted the invitation; and, impressed with an earnest desire to serve the cause of religious truth, quitted one of the most respectable situations as a minister among the Dissenters, amidst whom, besides, he had established the most elegible family connections, to commence, at so advanced a period of his life, so laborious an office as that of a tutor in theology. And the society assembling in the Octagon, at Norwich, with great generosity and public-spirit, not only concurred in this mutual sacrifice, but, many of them, very liberally contributed to the funds of the institution.

Of Dr. Taylor, a tolerably correct life is published in the Universal Theological Magazine, for July, 1804, (vol. ii. p. 1.) which being a publication in the hands of many readers of the Repository, I have the less need to enlarge in this place. It appears that he was born at Lancaster, in 1694, that he studied under Dr. Dixon, at Whitehaven, and settled in 1715, at Kirkstead, in Lincolnshire*; the salary enjoyed at which place, (which, in a letter published in the same vol. p. 131, he represents as a little country village, out of the sight or hearing of any thing that is vicious,) being small he kept a boarding-school. Here he probably laid in that fund of solid learning, from which he afterwards drew so liberally, for the promotion of scriptural knowledge. His views of particular disputed points were, as yet, probably, different from what they afterwards were, though this is by no means certain, from his recommending Pool's Annotations, and expressing his purpose of abridging Matthew Henry; a work which would have been, and would still be, very useful. His first actual publication was his masterly Defence of the Common Rights of Christians, prefixed to the case of a Mr. Rawson, who was excluded from communion by Mr. Sloss, of Nottingham, for asserting the Unity of God. In 1733, he removed to Norwich, and in 1740 published his Scripture-Doctrine of Original Sin, which soon was warmly attacked by Dr. Watts, Dr. Jennings and Mr. Wesley, and ably defended by the author, in his Supplement published in 1741. In 1745, appeared his Paraphrase on the Romans, with a Key to the Apostolic Writings, in which are many valuable remarks, though it also contains some theories which have been considered as fanciful, particularly his idea of a two-fold sense of the word Justification; which probably led Dr. Priestley to find so little satisfaction in its perusal: besides many smaller pieces, among which his Scripture Doctrine of Atonement, is an ingenious attempt to construct a scheme which shall be consistent with the moral perfections of the Father of Mercies, and at the same time, enable a man to use the language of reputed orthodoxy Like all such half measures, however, it is generally allowed to have failed of its object. In 1754, came out his great work, a Hebrew Concordance, in two large folio volumes, for which the University of Glasgow conferred upon him the honorary degree of D. D. His subsequent publications will be noticed in the next communication, in which an attempt will be made to describe his mode of conducting the theological studies of his pupils, so far as it can now be discovered.

---

* Some curious circumstances are said to have lately occurred here, respecting the right of the Dissenters to occupy the church, which perhaps some of your Lincolnshire correspondents could lay before your readers. [See vol. vii. p. 757.]

Of Mr. Holt the present writer has been able to discover very little. He is said to have been, for some time, a minister at or near Lancaster; but for a considerable period previous to his settlement, he had kept a large mathematical and commercial school at Kirkdale, near Liverpool. A number of the merchants of the last age both in Liverpool and Manchester, were educated by him. He continued to hold the place of Mathematical Tutor till his death, in 1772, and during the earlier periods of the academy, had a considerable number, and always some of the students, boarded with him. He is represented by his pupils, as having been very much master of his subject, but that, from a hesitating and embarrassed manner, he failed of making it interesting to his pupils. He was very exact in hearing them demonstrate their propositions, and in examining their algebraic calculations, but if any difficulty occurred, he was not ready at illustration. On these accounts, his department does not appear to have been popular, and several instances occur in the minutes of the Trustees' meetings, of interferences, sometimes rather impertinent ones, with regard to his management of his classes. In his experiments in natural philosophy, he is said to have been accurate and successful, clear in his illustration of the principles to be deduced from them, and ready to answer questions that were proposed, and to solve difficulties that were started.

Mr. Dyer, who had been proposed by Mr. Holland, his fellow-student at Northampton, and warmly recommended by Drs. Avery, Ward, Benson and Chandler, declined the invitation to become the Tutor in the Classics and Polite Literature. And if the account given of him in the Life of Johnson, by Sir John Hawkins, is not a very exaggerated picture, (it is evidently a little tinctured both with political and religious bigotry,) it was happy for the institution that he did not accept it. If there had not been too good grounds for many of Sir John's representations, it is probable that some of his more intimate friends would have vindicated his character: but if it is only a tolerably correct statement, it holds out a very instructive lesson to young men of talents and learning of the great importance of decidedly choosing, and then resolutely and actively pursuing, some one useful course of life, and the fatal effects of suffering the spirit of indecision to grow into a habit. This danger is particularly incident to young men who, like Mr. Dyer, possess some original independent property, which they are apt to imagine sets them above the necessity of active exertion, which they will soon find is the only road to usefulness and respectability.

To supply Mr. Dyer's place, Mr. Scott, of Ipswich, (well known by his translation of Job and his Lyric Poems,) was recommended by the friends of the institution at Norwich, Mr. Joseph Priestley* by Dr. Benson, and Mr. Aikin,† of Kibworth, by Messrs. Orton, Clarke and others. Though each of these gentlemen was eminently qualified, the choice happily fell upon Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Aikin, whose great and important services to the institution, both in the classical and mathematical departments, in the dignified excellence of his all-accomplished character, and particularly in his whole demeanour to his pupils, whom he uniformly treated (as Dr. Priestley has well observed) "with the ease of a friend, and the affection of a father," demand a more extended tribute of grateful respect, which it will be the honour and happiness of the writer, in a future number, according to his best ability to pay.

In the mean time, the Trustees proceeded to engage houses for the Tutors, and rooms for a common-hall and library, and the academy opened, on the 20th of October, 1757, under the direction of Dr. Taylor and Mr. Holt; the highly respectable name of Thomas Percival standing first on the list of students.

[To be continued.]

EXTRACTS FROM NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Sketch of the Practice of the Royal Touch in England, or a historical Essay on the memorable Empiricism of our English Sovereigns, from Edward the Confessor to George the First.

[From "The History of Lynn," *in 2 vols.* 8vo. By William Richards, M. A. 1812. 1l. 11s. 6d.—Section IX.—It falls not within our province to review topographical works, but these volumes contain so much interesting miscellaneous and theological matter, that we cannot forbear recommending them to our readers; which, perhaps, we shall do most effectually by presenting them with the following extract of a curious morsel of history.— Ed.]

It is generally agreed that this notable practice, which appears to have been long deemed as a branch of the royal prerogative, began in this kingdom with, or in the person of Edward the Confessor.[*] Some however seem to think it to have existed in France at an earlier period: if so, Edward, who had long lived in that country, and appeared very partial to it, and fond of French fashions, might take the hint from thence, and introduce it here upon his accession to the throne, which he might easily manage by the help of the monks, with whom he was so great a favourite.

---

* The following passage in Mr. Seddon's Letter to Dr. Benson, declining his recommendation of Mr. Priestley, is illustrative of the idea which his friends had formed of this extraordinary man,—"The Trustees are sensible how desirable it is that their intended tutor should have a steady attachment to the principles of civil and religious liberty, of an active lively disposition, equal to so laborious an employment, and of application that would promise a future improvement; at the same time, they are not without some apprehension of his being thought too young to sustain the character of a tutor, that the subscribers, in general, might expect a person rather more advanced in years, and, if not more perfectly acquainted in the several parts of learning, yet more known in the world, and longer experienced in life and manners. They are informed, too, *that he has some hesitation and interruption in his manner of speaking:* whether it be so considerable as to be worthy of any regard, or how far it might be likely to have an unfortunate effect in forming the voice and manner of the students, they are not able to judge."

† The following passage in Mr. Seddon's letter to Mr. Aikin is curious, as shewing what an alteration in the state of the county of Lancaster, must have taken place in so short a time. Giving directions for his journey, (March 11, 1758,) he says, "You will do well to come prepared for riding, for you will not meet with any carriages at Stockport, nor are the roads to Warrington from thence proper for them."

Clovis, and *Robert* of sainted memory, are named among the early French sovereigns who successfully practiced the royal touch, and were greatly admired and venerated by their subjects on that account. In the reign of *Philip* the first, the virtue is supposed to have been somehow lost, but happily revived again with undiminished splendour in that of Lewis the Fat, after which it seems to have long and regularly continued. Francis I.[†] and Henry IV. are represented as eminent practitioners; how it was with the succeeding monarchs, descended from the latter, we are not informed. No particular attention appears to have been paid to it yet by the emperor Napoleon. What he may think proper to do hereafter, no tongue can tell. Whether he possesses this power or not, it is certain that he possesses some other powers in as great a degree, at least, as any of his royal or imperial predecessors.

But this miraculous gift of healing did not, it seems, belong exclusively to the kings of France and England[*]. The earls, or princes of the house of Hapsburg also, are reported to have had it in no scanty measure. They cured the strumous, or scrofulous, it is said, by giving them drink, and the stammerers by kissing them. But the kings of Hungary seem to have exceeded all; for we are told that they *could* cure, not only the king's evil, but all disorders occasioned by poison, the bite of a viper, or any other venemous animal. "Mr. *Bel*, who tells us this, observes (what is as remarkable as the account itself) that he cannot find in history, that these Hungarian kings ever exercised this wonderful power."[†] More shame for them, the unfeeling wretches! if they possessed it.

"The case was otherwise with the royal doctors of France and England, who have not been so shy of exerting this power, or rather, of practising this quackery. Some French writers (says Carte) ascribe this gift of healing to the king's devotion towards the relics of St. Marculf, in the Church of Corbigny, in Champagne, to which the kings of France, immediately after their coronation at Rheims, used to go in solemn procession: and it must be owned there was formerly a great veneration paid to this saint in England. It was in memory of him that a room in the palace of Westminster, frequently mentioned in the rolls of Parliament, was called the chamber of St. Marculf; being probably the place where our kings touched for the evil. It is now (our historian adds) called the painted chamber: and though the name of that saint hath been long forgot in this nation, yet the sanative virtue of our kings still continues."*

---

[*] "*Ailred* as well as *Malmsbury* observes, that the Confessor cured a young married woman, reduced by the evil to a deplorable condition, by stroking the place affected with his hand; upon which she grew sensibly better, the humour dispersed, the scar wore off, and in a week's time the cure was perfected!!!"—Carte 1, 357.

[†] That Francis touched for the evil is said to be averred by Servetus, in his 1st edition of Ptolemy's Geography. Of its success, indeed, we are told that he appeared far from being a believer.

[*] Nor does it appear that it belonged exclusively to certain *Christian* potentates; for long before there were any such, it had been ascribed to the pagan emperors, Vespasian and Hadrian, who are said by their touch, to have restored sight to the blind; and the fact seems as well established as any of the accounts of cures effected by the touch of our Christian and English monarchs.

[†] See *Occasional Thoughts on the Power of curing the king's evil, ascribed to the kings of England*——superadded to Werenfel's Disertation upon superstition in natural things. Lond. 1748.

Of the most noted among our sovereigns, as practitioners in this healing art, the following is thought a pretty complete list. Nothing seems to be known in this way of Harold II. or yet of the four succeeding princes; but that Henry II. practised very successfully, is said to be attested by Petrus Blesensis, who had been his chaplain † It seems highly probable that Henry III. likewise was often applied to, and successfully practised in the same way, as John of Geddesden, a physician, who is said to live about that time, advises a scrofulous patient, after his remedies had proved ineffectual, to apply to the king for a cure: for which he has been much blamed, and seemingly not without reason, as, in case he deemed the royal touch a certain cure or remedy, he ought to have sent the patient to the king at first, without troubling him with operation and medicine.*

Henry's great son, Edward I. also appears to have been no mean master of this same art; and so, probably, might be his son, Edward II. though otherwise no great conjurer; but as to his son, Edward III. few, if any seem to have gone beyond him in this sanative employment. *Bradwardine*, who attended him in his wars, and whose counsel is said to have contributed to his success, gives a pompous advertisement, in his book *De Causa Dei*, of the wonderful cures wrought by that prince. *F. le Brun*, however, pays no regard to this. He looks upon it as a crafty stratagem, and says, he does not doubt but that Edward's pretensions to the crown of France, excited his zeal to touch those who were diseased; which is not unlikely, princes often, when nothing but politics lie at the bottom, chusing to make religion to swim on the the top.† Edward's grandson, Richard II. cannot be supposed to drop or lay aside a practice for which his grandfather and immediate predecessor on the throne had been so celebrated. Nor is it at all likely that his successors, of the rival house of Lancaster, should discontinue this practice, as that might have been construed to imply a consciousness of inferiority to the princes of the other house, or something like a defect in their own title to the crown.

---

* Carte, i. 357.

† Carte adds, that Archbishop *Bradwardine*, Lord Chancellor *Fortescue*, and other grave authors, give the like testimony in behalf of the cure, as well as the practice, by that prince's successors;—[Richard I. John, Henry III. and the three Edwards, we may suppose.] Carte, as before.

* *Occasional Thoughts*, as before, 58.

†Ibid.

Least of all is it to be supposed that this practice should be dropt or neglected afterwards, on the restoration of the York line, in the person of *Edward IV.* who would naturally take care to exercise every prerogative or power supposed to have belonged to his ancestors, and which had any way contributed to their popularity, consequence, or celebrity. This monarch, though of a far less religious or devout cast than his immediate predecessor Henry VI. might not on that account be the less qualified to work these miracles, any more than *Charles II.* afterwards; who, though by his clerical subjects denominated *most religious*, was yet certainly, in fact, one of the *most irreligious* and profligate wretches that ever wore a crown; nevertheless, he unquestionably practised the *royal touch*, as extensively, effectually and successfully as any one whatever, in the whole list of our crowned, or kingly practitioners. And why not?—as the extraordinary gift, supernatural virtue, or miraculous power, belonged entirely, it seems, to his regal quality or dignity;* and had nothing at all, apparently, to do with his personal or moral character.

Richard III. also, after he ascended the throne, may be supposed to possess as much of this supernatural and sanative virtue (whatever may be said of the other virtues) as any one of his predecessors or successors; and as it was evidently his interest to omit no popular observance, and to avail himself of whatever had a tendency to excite or gain the admiration of the people, and reconcile them to his government, we may be sure he would not fail, to follow, with spirit, the practice in question; and so, by a copious display of its sanative virtue, compensate, in some sort, or degree, for the absence of virtues of another description. There is therefore abundant reason for setting him down among our royal miracle-workers.

None of all these princes appear to have made a greater figure, or to have proceeded with more parade, solemnity and success, in this royal business or occupation than Henry VII.—This politic prince, whatever right he might have to the crown, had probably as good a right as any one to try his hand at this notable and wonder-working operation, the effect or fame of which he knew full well how to manage profitably and turn to the best account. He accordingly set about it in good earnest; and in order, as may be supposed, to give the process the most striking, sacred, and solemn appearance, and increase its effect, he had a new form, or office, composed and introduced for the purpose.† The project answered;

---

* Though some, perhaps, would choose to ascribe that gift, virtue, or power, rather to the *throne*, as the *infallibility of the pope* has, by one of our old satirists, been ascribed to the *papal chair*, in some such lines as the following:—

If the devil himself should get there,
Although he be full of all evil,
Yet such is the virtue in Peter's old chair,
He would be an infallible devil.

† *Occasional Thoughts*, as before, p. 60.—Also, *New Ann. Reg.* 13, [180.] —It does not appear who, among Henry's

and his success in this practice is said to have been very considerable. This prince would also sometimes take upon him to *con-*

---

bishops or ecclesiastics, drew up this new office for his use: but we find that it went in the manner and form following:—*First, the King kneeling, shall say,* "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. *And as soon as he hath said that, he shall say,* Give the blessing. *The chaplain kneeling before the king, and having a stole about his neck, shall answer and say,* "The Lord be in your heart and in your lips, to confess all your sins. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. *Or else he shall say,* "Christ hear us. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. *Then by and by the king shall say,* "I confess to God, to the blessed virgin *Mary*, to all the saints, and to you, that I have sinned in thought, word and deed, through my fault: I pray holy *Mary* and all the saints of God to pray for me." *The chaplain shall answer and say,* "Almighty God have mercy on you, and pardon you all your sins, deliver you from all evil, and confirm you in good, and bring you to everlasting life. Amen. "The almighty and merciful Lord grant you absolution and remission of all your sins, time for repentance and amendment of life, with the grace and comfort of his holy spirit. Amen." *This done the chaplain shall say,* The Lord be with you. *The king shall answer,* And with thy spirit. *The chaplain,* Part of the Gospel according to St. Mark. *The king shall answer,* Glory to thee O Lord. *The chaplain reads the Gospel,* "Last he appeared to those eleven as they sat at the table: and he exprobated their incredulity and hardness of heart, because they did not believe them that had seen him risen again. And he said them: going into the whole world, preach the gospel to all creatures. He that believeth and is baptised, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned. And them that believe these signs shall follow: in my name shall they cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues. Serpents shall they take up, and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them; they shall impose hands upon the sick and they shall be whole." *Which last clause,* (They shall impose, &c.) *the chaplain repeats as long as the king is handling the sick person. And in the time of repeating the aforesaid words,* (they shall impose, &c.) *the clerk of the closet shall kneel before the king, having the sick person on the right hand; and the sick person shall also kneel before the king: and the king shall lay his hand upon the sore of the sick person. This done the chaplain shall make an end of the gospel.* "And so our Lord Jesus, after he spake unto them, was assumpted into heaven and sate on the right hand of God. But they going forth, preached every where; our Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs which followed. *Whilst this is reading, the chirurgeon shall lead away the sick person from the king. And after the gospel the chaplain shall say,* The Lord be with you. *The king shall answer,* And with thy spirit. *The chaplain,* The beginning of the Gospel according to St. John. *The king,* Glory to thee O Lord. *The chaplain then shall say the Gospel following,* [*i. e. the first words of John's Gospel, ending at verse 9th.*] It was the true light which lighteneth every man that cometh into this world. *Which last clause* (It was the true light, &c.) *shall be repeated so long as the king shall be crossing the sore of the sick person, with an angel of gold noble, and the sick person to have the same angel hang'd about his neck, and to wear it until he be full whole. This done the chirurgeon shall lead away the sick person as he did before. and then the chaplain shall make an end of the gospel* [i. e. read on from verse 9th, where he left off before, to the end of verse 14]. *Then the chaplain shall say,* The Lord's name be praised. *The king shall answer,* Now and for ever. *Then shall the chaplain say this collect following, praying for the sick person or persons:* O Lord hear my prayer. *The King shall answer,* And let my cry come unto thee. *The chaplain,* Let us pray. "Almighty and everlasting God, the eternal health of them that believe; graciously hear us for thy servants for whom we implore the aid of thy mercy, that their health being restored to them, they may give thee thanks in thy church, through Christ our Lord. Amen."

This prayer following is to be said secretly, after the sick persons be departed from the King, at his pleasure.—"Almighty God, Ruler and Lord, by whose *vert heretics*; and he would even give them money to facilitate their conversion;* which was certainly no ill-adapted device, or unpromising expedient: and it is the more remarkable, as his majesty was himself so great a lover of money, and appears to have been so exceedingly close-fisted on other occasions. We may therefore be very sure that the conversion of heretics was of the highest importance in Henry's estimation, and what lay very near to his royal heart. This monarch also, with his queen and eldest son, visited the town of Lynn, where he very probably exercised the *royal touch*, as scrofulous patients may be supposed to have been then, as they are now, very numerous here, all of whom, as well as the rest of the inhabitants, would not fail to give full credit to his majesty's ability to remove the malady and restore the partients to perfect health; and, of course, would be anxious to apply to him, which he would not be likely to discourage. As to *heretics*, there might be then none of them here for him to try his royal hand at their conversion.

His son and high spirited successor, *Henry VIII.* would doubtless be careful to continue the practice of all the rites and ceremonies appertaining to the royal function, which had been handed down to him from his father: and there is every reason to believe that the operation in question would not be forgotten or omitted, were it only to be even with his neighbour and rival, *Francis I.* who certainly performed it, and would not be likely to be suffered or allowed to go beyond him on such an occasion. Henry therefore may be safely set down among our said royal practitioners, and even among the most able and powerful of them all. But the *King's evil* was not the only evil in whose cure or removal he was

---

goodness the blind see, the deaf hear, the dumb speak, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and all sick persons are healed of their infirmities: by whom also alone the gift of healing is given to mankind, and so great a grace, through thine unspeakable goodness towards this realm, is granted unto the kings thereof, that by the sole imposition of their hands, a most grievous and filthy disease should be cured: mercifully grant that we may give thee thanks therefore, and for this thy singular benefit conferred on us, not to ourselves, but to thy name let us daily give glory; and let us always so exercise ourselves in piety, that we may labour not only diligently to conserve, but every day more and more to encrease thy grace bestowed upon us: and grant that on whose bodies soever we have imposed hands in thy name, through this thy virtue working in them, and through our ministry, may be restored to their former health, and being confirmed therein, may perpetually with us give thanks to thee the chief physician and healer of all diseases; and that henceforth they may so lead their lives, as not their bodies only from sickness, but their souls also from sin may be perfectly purged and cured: through our Lord Jesus Christ thy son, who liveth and reigneth with thee in the unity of the Holy Ghost, God world without end. Amen."

The reader will readily perceive that the above office, or formulary was entirely of *popish* manufacture; the king and whole nation being then *Papists*; but it probably differed not much, if at all, from those used afterwards by our *Protestant* princes, except in the article of *invoking* the *Virgin Mary* and the *saints*; in which also consists, seemingly, the chief difference between the *Romish* and *English Liturgies:* in other respects the resemblance is great and striking; which is not much to be wondered at, as the model of the latter is pretty well known to have been taken from the former.

* Seward's Anecdotes, i. 38.

particularly concerned:—he was no less concerned in the cure or removal of the *Pope's evil*, another dreadful malady, which had long and grievously afflicted most of the good people of this country, and which was generally deemed incurable, till he took it in hand. All the world know how powerfully and effectually *his royal touch* operated on that occasion.—It seems he had also the reputation of being endowed with extraordinary gifts for the cure or prevention of the *cramp;* and we find that he distinguished himself by the consecration of *cramp rings,* which Stephen Gardiner says were much esteemed every where, and often sought for.* So very eminent was Henry among our royal doctors and miracle-mongers.

(*To be continued.*)

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Essay on the Infinity of Creation.

Nov. 27th, 1812.

Though *the unbounded extent of the Divine works* be rather a philosophical than a theological subject, it is not, however, an uninteresting and useless speculation: and, though it rest upon *probable* evidence, without admitting of strict *demonstration,* we may give no irrational assent to the arguments for this doctrine.

The proposition of which I shall attempt the illustration, and, as far as possible the proof, is, that creation has no limits conceivable by the human understanding and imagination. What orders of beings inhabit other planets and systems, what are their structure, powers and employments, I pretend not to explain.

There are four considerations on which I shall insist,—the infinity of the Divine attributes—the extreme difficulty, not to say the impossibility of supposing that *space* is either bounded or unoccupied—the construction and appearances of the heavens—and certain analogies discoverable in nature.

Power, wisdom and benevolence are the grand attributes of God, and we justly ascribe them to him without measure and imperfection. From reason and revelation we further derive a persuasion of the supreme excellence of his moral character: hence we gain the belief that he is good in the highest sense of the expression, that he is disposed to produce the greatest sum of happiness, and to produce it in the best and most effectual manner.

Shall we assert then that the attributes of the Deity are *infinite,* but that the effects of them are, nevertheless *finite?* Can we place limits to the one, I mean when they are regarded collectively, not individually, while we maintain that none are assignable to the other? Let us suppose that an inferior being has both the inclination and the capacity to create a given quantity of happiness within his sphere: what can restrain him from creating it? By the conditions of the statement he has no defect of either will or power.—But if this reasoning be of any weight, how far more forcibly may we apply it to him who is absolutely perfect! Is he omnipotent? Nothing can obstruct the boundless extent of his operations. Is he unerringly wise? He knows how to attain every object which he has in view. Is he infinitely good? He cannot meditate the production of a limited sum of happiness, while the greatest is equally within his power and, as the very words *infinite goodness* imply, equally his desire.

---

* *Occasional Thoughts*, as before, p. 61.

However naturally and commonly we err in entertaining low thoughts of the Supreme Being, we cannot, on the other hand, form too elevated ideas of his perfections and operations; though when we conceive of the universe as bounded, even while we extend it in fancy, to a considerable degree, it still bears no adequate proportion to its Divine Cause.

If a man direct his eyes from any spot upon the earth to a given object, and remark that between himself and this object there is a portion of air or land or water, he acquires hence the idea of *space:* nor can he easily regard space as bounded. Now, for a moment, let him imagine that the universe is limited, and let him place himself on its confines. In this case, I believe, the thought would instantly occur to him, that *all beyond* is a dark, indeed, but a real void, unoccupied by bodies, yet capable of containing bodies. And can a devout and benevolent mind be satisfied with the conclusion, that such an immense vacuity has been left by the great Creator, that there is so vast and untenanted a waste in the possession of the Sovereign proprietor? How far more rational and elevating is the conviction that the boundless regions of space are peopled by an innumerable multitude and variety of beings, percipient, intellectual and moral, each fitted to share in the bounty, each fulfilling the sublime purposes, and exhibiting, in different ways, the glory of its Maker!

Let us next inquire, what are the planets which revolve around the sun as their common centre? What those stars and clusters of stars, which the eye discerns in the heavens, on a cloudless night? Sound philosophy rejects the notion that they shine and glitter, merely for the entertainment or the accommodation of mankind.

Compared with some of the planets belonging to our system, what are the bulk and circumference of this globe? What, indeed, is the system itself, when contrasted with that number ("a number," perhaps, "which no man can reckon,") of stars which are justly thought to be other suns, and to make parts of other systems? Reasoning from what falls within the sphere of our discoveries and observation, together with what is known of the Divine omnipotence and goodness, is there no probability, that most of these glorious luminaries are the mansions of different classes of creatures, whose structure and constitution are severally adapted to their respective situations?

Large as is the catalogue of stars and constellations, which are perceptible by the naked eye, our sight, when it has not the assistance of art, reaches only to a small proportion of the number. But when we learn that one hundred and sixteen thousand pass through the view of a telescope of moderate dimensions, in a quarter of an hour, when we further know that every improvement in glasses enables us to discover stars not seen before, when it is found that the tract in the firmament, which bears the name of *the Milky Way*, is, in truth, a most extensive bed of many millions of stars, of various sizes, among which our sun, it would seem, ought to be ranked, and when it appears that there are other *milky ways* scattered through the expanse of the heavens, together with collections of stars, beyond the capacity of any man to count, variously disposed and formed, and separated from each other by considerable intervals, we must, assuredly, deem it improbable that these globes are uninhabited, and must entertain nobler and juster sentiments of the extent and magnificence of the universe.

We perceive numerous classes of creatures, in regular descent, below us: Nature so abounds with life as to render it difficult of belief that a single particle of matter, wherever it is found, contains not sentient beings; and though it be fair to conclude that the like gradation takes place upward, and from the human race even to the Supreme Intelligence, yet mankind evidently stand at the head of the globe that we inhabit.

Now, since the distance must ever be infinite between the Creator and the creature, we may infer that, for the display of this infinitely rising superiority, an immense number and variety of worlds were to be produced. Nor is the difficulty greater of conceiving that the works of God are unlimited, than of conceiving thus of his perfections: nor is it less easy for such a Being to form innumerable worlds, than to form numberless varieties of plants and flowers.

I may add that the idea of an universe infinitely extended indeed but all the parts of which have a mutual connection, are subservient to one sublime end and are governed with perfect facility and rectitude, by one ruling mind, is far sublimer and more rational than that of a vast yet limited universe, of which the parts are few and unrelated.

In Mr. Addison's opinion upon this subject, there is an apparent, if not a real inconsistency: "There *is no question,*" says he, "*but the universe has certain bounds set to it;* but when we consider that it is the work of infinite power, prompted by infinite goodness, with an infinite space to exert itself in, how can our imagination set any bounds to it?"* He seems to have felt the strength of the evidence, and yet to have been afraid of the conclusion.

A deservedly admired writer of our own times, has represented the vast extent of creation in some of the most majestic strains and harmonious numbers of poetry. My readers will find the following lines in Mrs. Barbauld's *Summer Evening's Meditation:*

——What hand unseen
Impels me onward thro' the glowing orbs
Of habitable nature, far remote,
To the dread confines of eternal night,
To *solitudes of vast unpeopled space,*
The deserts of creation, wide and wild;
Where embryo systems and unkindled suns
Sleep in the womb of chaos?——

This is true sublimity: our conceptions are elevated, our imagination is affected, our fancy and our expectation are still kept on the stretch by the description. The genius of this lady, always conspicuous, is never so pre-eminent as when she paints scenes of waste, ruin and desolation. The hymn where she draws a picture of the wreck of

---

* Spectator. No. 565.

"This fair world, the creature of a day,"

and her poem, intitled "The year Eighteen Hundred and Eleven*" are inimitable in their kind. Whether all her views be strictly just, is another consideration. If the reasoning of the present essay is in any tolerable degree correct, her idea of "solitudes of vast unpeopled space, &c." must be looked upon as rather poetical than philosophical. N.

Socinian Tracts.

Sir,

I know not to whom I can apply with so much propriety, as to your readers, for information, which I very much want, concerning the old Socinian Tracts.

Three volumes of these, published in 1691, 1692 and 1694, in small 4to. are in my possession. My inquiries relate to the printer, editor and supposed contributors, and to the immediate effect produced on the public mind.

I have heard that a *fourth*, and even a *fifth* volume were published. Has any one of your readers seen either of these volumes? Or, is any account of them on record?

Should any of your learned correspondents, condescend to satisfy me in these particulars, he will find, in due time, that his labour is not thrown away.

FILIUS POLONORUM.

Account of a Publication of the Rev. Joseph Milner's, by Mr. Rutt.

Bromley, Jan. 3, 1813.

Sir,

Since I sent you the Memoir of the Rev. J. B. Dewhurst, [vol. VII. pp. 729—749.] it occurred to me that I had in my possession a book written by Mr. Milner. On referring to it, I found that the author was Mr. D's. tutor, a circumstance which I regret not to have discovered sooner. The book has this title, *Gibbon's Account of Christianity considered: together with some Strictures on Hume's Dialogues concerning Natural Religion. By Joseph Milner, A. M. Master of the Grammar School of Kingston upon Hull. York.* 1781.

On the merit of this work, as a defence of Christianity against the insidious attacks of Hume and Gibbon, I have no design, and indeed am incompetent, to offer any opinion, never, so far as I recollect, having read the volume, and having now only looked through it to ascertain the pious author's turn of mind, on points of doctrine, still controverted among Christians. Many of your readers, especially the friends of the late Mr. Dewhurst, will, I am persuaded, share with me in the very natural curiosity, to have more information respecting his earliest instructor, than the Memoir could supply. The following passages will discover the high tone of Mr. Milner's orthodoxy.

---

* Tunc etiam latis aperit Cassandra futuris
Ora, Dei jussu non unquam credita Teucris.

In his 8th Section, (p. 154) entitled *Rationality*, while he praises the "admirable Treatise on the Human Understanding," he thus severely animadverts on the author's *theological* writings. "Mr. Locke led the fashion in introducing a pompous parade of *reasoning* into religion; from that time a *rational* religion has been the cant term, with all who profess to be wiser than others. The proper humble subserviency of Reason to Christianity, as a very useful but very submissive handmaid, has been discarded.—He appears to know little or nothing of that divine faith, which the scripture describes; from Locke down to Hume, that is to say, from a cold historical assent down to atheism itself, or to what is much the same, there has been a gradual melancholy declension from evangelical simplicity. Reason has impertinently meddled with the gospel, and that with such overbearing sedulity, as to darken it more and more; and rivers of tears would not suffice to bewail the increase of moral misery, which, since Mr. Locke's time, has pervaded these kingdoms." After undertaking what he calls an *easy* task, "in a summary way, to answer Mr. Locke's account of the provinces of faith, and reason, and of enthusiasm," in which "his account of the distinct provinces of faith and reason is" described as "insidious and weak" and "his whole account of enthusiasm is obviated in a word." Mr. Milner, towards the close of the section, complains that "the concessions of Locke to infidels, have given them advantages which they prosecute with merciless rigour:"—in another place, (p. 199.) he describes *Hume* "as following the *rational* scent of Mr. Locke, who first, unhappily, gave Reason leave to intrude herself into the secrets of Christianity."

Mr. Milner thus ventured to describe as *a cold historical assent* the Christianity of a man, who had solaced the decline of a long and exemplary life by studying the scriptures, and indulging, even to his last moments, *the hope of the gospel.* But Mr. Locke recovers reputation, when compared with *modern Socinians.* Socinianism, indeed, appears to have been the *monstrum et horrendum*, the *raw-head and bloody bones*, which alarmed this good man's imagination, obscured his judgment, and even exposed to suspicion his *integrity*, as a writer. Speaking of "Mr. Gibbon, in the case of Paul of Samosata," and his *supposed* vices, Mr. Milner adds: "His views seem, on the whole, to have much resembled those of the modern Socinians. No wonder that his life was wicked. Men may talk of virtue, but provision for the effectual practice of it is only attained in the school of Christ, from which, in reality, Socinianism is as abhorrent as any Deism whatever. The atonement and intercession of God the Son, and the influence of God the Holy Ghost, being excluded or explained away, nothing remains of the gospel, in effect, but what it has in common with the religion of nature." (p. 247.)

Here, after *interpolating* the *gospel* with a *God the Son,* and a *God the Holy Ghost,* this writer, no doubt unconscious of the wrong, proceeds to spoil *Socinianism* of her faith in *a resurrection both of the just and the unjust*, and the obligations of *righteousness and temperance*, under the sanctions of a *judgment to come by the man Christ Jesus.* Thus forlorn, she is turned out to associate with *the religion of Nature.* Mr. Milner's account of Socinianism reminds me of Warburton's charge against Mallett, "that he had written the Life of Lord Bacon, and forgotten that Bacon was a *philosopher*." Mr. Milner has indeed incurred the censure of his own motto,—

> *—male verum examinat omnis*
> *Corruptus judex.* *Hor.*

Yet he must be allowed to have been corrupted in his judgment, not by any criminal purpose. His excuse may be given in his own language respecting *Gibbon*, (Pref. v.) of whose misrepresentations he says, that "it is very uncandid to impute that to *design*, which arises from *prejudice*," and adds "what object will not this last discolour?" Mr. Milner could live in the country of *Biddle*, *Firmin* and *Lardner*, and be insensible to the virtues which might consist with Socinianism. Yet he would neither persecute for the supposed crime of opinion, nor apologize for real criminality. He thus writes, (p. 81), "Detested be the spirit of persecution, though found in Calvin: detested be murder and adultery, though found in the man after God's own heart."

It is worthy of remark that Socinianism has been variously treated by divines of the same Established Church, from whom might have been expected a uniformity of censure, as they *profess* a uniformity of faith. Mr. Milner resolved Socinianism into the mere religion of nature. On the other hand, the learned and philosophizing Dr. Henry More, expressly censured Socinianism, or rather Socinus, for referring even the first principles of religion to divine revelation, and so denying a religion of nature in any proper sense of the term. I refer to one of the letters of Dr. H. More, annexed to his Life, (8vo. p. 358.) and dated from Christ's College, Cambridge, Oct. 25, 1677. His words are remarkable, "'Tis most certain, that the *Socinians* are a dry, strait-laced people; and for want of *philosophy*, and of that better spirit which inclines men to *religion*, even from their *natural genius*, are most-what mere legulious interpreters of the scripture; though they think none comparable to themselves. How meanly they are appointed for these pretensions, the *father* of them may witness against them; who was of so mean and sunk a *genius*, that he denied the *existence of God* could be proved, or discovered by the light of *natural reason*."

My respected friend Dr. Toulmin, in the *Memoirs of Socinus*, has quoted (p. 216.) some passages from his works, upon this subject. To these Dr. H. More probably referred. This opinion of Socinus has been ably maintained by a divine of the Church of Ireland, Dr. John Ellis, Vicar of St. Catharine's, Dublin. His work was published in 1771, after the author's death, in 1 vol. 8vo. entitled, *The knowledge of Divine things from Revelation, not from Reason or Nature.* A large account of this then very scarce, but lately, I think, reprinted, work was given by Mr. Thomas Christie, in his *Miscellanies*, mentioned in your 6th vol. p. 582.—But I have been led away from Mr. Milner, with whose views it was indeed benevolent to warn his pupil against *the errors of the Socinians.*

Since the Memoir was concluded, I have been kindly informed, by a correspondent at Hull, that Mr. Joseph Milner "was in high reputation in the town and neighbourhood, as an evangelical preacher, and was a very high churchman;" also, that "his classical literature was generally esteemed far to exceed the ordinary standard. Mr. Milner was, at the time of his death, (Nov. 15, 1797.) Vicar of the principal church in the town, called the Holy Trinity. His age was fifty-three."

I remain, Sir,
Yours,
J. T. RUTT.

Scottish Blasphemy Act.

Sir,

The English Blasphemy Act is well known, and through the exertions of Mr. William Smith, in the House of Commons, will, it is hoped, be soon known as it deserves, and banished to its own place: but I apprehend the *Scottish Blasphemy Act* is matter of less notoriety. I beg, therefore, to extract an account of it, exhibiting also an instance of its fatal operation, from "*Collections and Observations, concerning the Worship, Discipline and Government of the Church of Scotland. In four Books. By Walter Stewart, of Pardovan.* Edinburgh, 1773." 8vo.

Book iii. Title 1. "*Of Apostacy and atheistical Opinions of Deists,*" § 3, is as follows:—

"By the 11th Act of King William, Parl. 1695, it is ordained that whoever shall, in their writing or discourse, deny, impugn or quarrel, argue or reason against the being of God, or any of the Persons of the blessed Trinity, or the authority of the Holy Scriptures, or the providence of God, in the government of the world, shall, for the first fault be punished with imprisonment, ay and while they find bail, to give satisfaction, in sackcloth, to the congregation within which the scandal was committed; and for the second fault, the delinquent shall be fined in one year's valued rent, and the twentieth part of his free personal estate, besides his being imprisoned, ay and while he give satisfaction again, *ut supra*; and for the third fault, he shall be punished with death, as an obstinate blasphemer. Accordingly one *Aikenhead* was hanged for that crime, betwixt Leith and Edinburgh, about the year 1697." pp. 142, 143.

As this instrument nearly affects the Scottish Unitarians, perhaps some one of them, competent to the task, will inform your readers whether it be still in force, and also, whether there be any record of the character, offence and sufferings of the above-mentioned *Aikenhead.* Was he a proper Unitarian martyr, or did he die for professed irreligion and open prophaneness?

An answer to these inquiries will particularly oblige

BIDELLIANUS.

Mr. Flower's Strictures on Mr. Belsham's Account of Robert Robinson, in his Memoirs of Theophilus Lindsey.

Harlow, Dec. 5, 1812.

Sir,

Being lately on a visit to a much

esteemed friend, of whom such honourable mention is made in Mr. Belsham's recent work, Mr. Reynolds, of Paxton, he presented me with a copy. The volume contains such a mass of valuable information, respecting one of the *excellent of the earth*, that I am sorry it should have been mixed with materials which, I fear, will somewhat diminish its value. Strictures on certain parts, have already appeared in your Repository; but if there be one part which, in my opinion, calls for animadversion more than another, it is that which relates to the late ROBERT ROBINSON of CAMBRIDGE; a man, in whose writings, and for whose character, you, Sir, and some of your readers, are sensible I have taken a lively interest, but who has, a second time, *been wounded in the house of a* professed *friend.* The impression which Mr. Belsham's statement is calculated to make, may be learned by the following extract of a letter I have just received from a minister well known, and much respected in the Christian world:—"Pray have you," says my friend, "read *Belsham's Memoirs of Lindsey?* The author gives a different view of Robinson's sentiments from what you had done*: *his view is not very creditable to Mr. Robinson's honesty.*" Now, Sir, as I have, I trust, not without success, already defended the character of the man I admire, from an attack somewhat similar, I shall venture on a second defence. I rely, therefore, on your wonted impartiality, in allotting me a few pages of your Repository on this occasion.

The biographer of Mr. Lindsey, commences his 7th Chapter with an account of one of Mr. Robinson's most popular works, "*A Plea for the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ;*" in which account there is, however, such inconsistency, that it is scarcely possible for a man of plain, unsophisticated sense, to form a proper judgment of the character or the merits of the work. The "Plea" is in one part described as a *Trinitarian*, and in another as a *Sabellian* performance: in some pages as a treatise "written with great ingenuity, combined with wit and eloquence;—containing forcible and unanswerable arguments against the Arian hypothesis;—accompanied with great liberality towards those who hold a different opinion, and breathing throughout a most amiable spirit of candour:" in the same chapter,—"as egregiously trifling, so far as argument is concerned;—containing a sort of defence of the Deity of the Son of God, which learned Trinitarians, the Bulls and Waterlands of a former age, would have blushed to avow; — consisting chiefly of a collection of texts, arranged as suited the author's purpose, without *any* attention to the connection, and even without *any* attempt to ascertain the correctness of the translation; and commented upon, and explained agreeably to his own preconceived opinions, in a dogmatical style, with all the confidence of inspiration itself! — Censuring Jesus Christ and his apostles, if they did not mean to teach the doctrine which he imputes to them, *not a suspi-*

---

* Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Robinson, prefixed to vol. i. of his Miscellaneous Works.

sion of which ever entered into their imaginations; not a single trace of which is to be discovered in their discourses and writings; and from the very idea of which they would have recoiled with horror.[*]"—Leaving the dashing assertions in the latter part of these quotations, to be reprobated as they deserve, by every reader of the New Testament, whose mind is not deeply tainted with prejudice, I proceed with the biographer's account of the "Plea."

Of this curious *Trinitarian* and *Sabellian* performance, so argumentative and so void of argument, so liberal, candid, dogmatical and self-sufficient, we are further informed, that, although, as we have seen, "the learned Trinitarians of a former age would have blushed to avow it," the learned Trinitarians of the present age, both in the established church and out of it, honoured it with their most marked approbation, and "courted the acquaintance of the author," and that "it was pretty generally agreed that the *Plea* was the best defence of the Divinity of Christ which had been published." If the reader can comprehend this "mixture of jarring and inconsistent opinions," (to borrow the language of the biographer) or from such a statement, form any just idea of the "Plea," he must possess a faculty of which I have no conception.

It must, indeed, appear surprising to Mr. Belsham, that a performance "in point of argument, so egregiously trifling," should have drawn forth "a profusion of compliments," from so many learned men; and that one in particular, the intimate friend of Mr. Lindsey, "the learned Archdeacon Blackburne," should rank amongst its warmest admirers. That admiration was too conspicuous to escape the notice of the biographer: but, that his readers might be guarded, in due time, from paying too much attention to the Archdeacon's judgment, we are told in the outset,—"This learned and eminent divine, *it is plain*, had paid more attention to the subject of Christian liberty than of theological controversy." I must, however, confess, that on a perusal of his writings, and after attending to the evidence produced by Mr. B. to me "it is plain," that the learned Archdeacon had paid almost as much attention to "theological controversy," in general, and to the controversy more immediately alluded to, in particular, as the learned biographer. The high panegyrics passed on the "Plea," the serious examination of its arguments, the number of texts consulted, the eager and industrious researches respecting any answer which might have escaped him,—all these circumstances, detailed by Mr. Belsham, afford demonstrative evidence of the Archdeacon's close and long-continued attention to this important subject.

Our author adds,—"It does not appear whether the Archdeacon was ever convinced of the futility of the arguments of the '*Plea*,' by the *Examination* of Mr. Lindsey." There is, however, some evidence on this point, presumptive and positive. Had the Archdeacon been convinced of the futility of the main arguments contained in the "Plea," surely the circumstance could not have escaped the attention of his friend Lindsey, with whom he so frequently corresponded, who must have possessed some curiosity, if not anxiety, on the subject, and and whose satisfaction at the conversion of so eminent a man, must have been so great, that it is highly improbable it should have remained a secret: but what follows affords direct and positive evidence, that the opinion of the Archdeacon, respecting the general merits of the "Plea," remained the same to the close of his life; for in the quotation from the Archdeacon's biographer, his son, the present worthy rector of Brignal, he thus expresses himself:—"We have not been able to discover that the Archdeacon's sentiments," [respecting the "Plea,"] "underwent *any chunge*, as he recommended the serious perusal of it, to some young clergymen, a very few weeks before his death." That the Archdeacon had attentively examined the answer of his friend Lindsey, which had been presented to him when first published, cannot be doubted; and it is as free from doubt, that he would not, at the close of his life, have recommended the "serious perusal" of the "Plea" to the young clergymen of his acquaintance, had not his opinion of its general excellence remained unaltered.

---

[*] It ought to be carefully noted, that the grand doctrine of the "Plea" is that of the "Deity uniting himself to the man Jesus Christ; and in whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead;" and from which, whatever alteration might take place in some of the author's explanations respecting it, there is no evidence he ever departed. See the "Plea," 4th Ed. p. 178, and Mr. Robinson's letter to Mr Lucas, written in the last year of his life.—Miscell. Works, vol. iv. p. 289.

From the popularity of the "Plea," and the deep impression it made on the public, we are informed that a reply was at length thought advisable; Mr. Lindsey, therefore, in 1785, about nine years after its first appearance, published, anonymously, his "Examination." A second edition, with the name of the author was published in 1789: of this performance Mr. Belsham presents us with a brief analysis, which he concludes as follows:—

"The success of this *Examination* was complete: from the time it was published, no person, *who had the least pretension to biblical learning*, was heard to open his lips in defence of this famous "Plea:" not a syllable was written in confutation of the reply. Those who would not retract were, at least, compelled to be silent; and it seemed to be *universally conceded*, *that* IF *the Divinity of Christ was to be defended at all*, it must be upon a very different ground from that which was occupied by this much-vaunted performance."

To this statement, I beg leave to reply that, confident as is the language of the writer, there is no evidence to support it; on the contrary, there is much to confute it. The "Examination," whatever are its merits, appears to have excited but little attention, compared with the "Plea;" four editions of the latter sold in less time than one of the former. In flat contradiction to Mr. F.'s assertion, "that it seemed to be *universally conceded*, that IF *the Divinity of Christ was to be defended at all*, it must be on very *different ground*, &c." I affirm, without fear of refutation, that many persons of undoubted talents, learning, piety and liberality, after reading both the "Plea" and the "Examination," were of opinion that, although there might be occasional inaccuracies in the former, (and, *perhaps*, in the latter) which on such a subject of controversy, need not excite surprise, the main arguments of the "Plea" remained unshaken. Will Mr. B. argue, that because no answer was written to the "Examination," it was unanswerable? I have never heard of any answer which the learned biographer has written to the strictures which have appeared on his famous adulatory Jubilee Sermon, or on his still more famous Letter of high-flown panegyric, addressed to his favourite statesman, the maker and the breaker of the treaty of Amiens, the author of an inglorious peace and an unjust war, one of the champions of corruption, sinecures, slave-trafficking and intolerance,—Lord *Sidmouth;* or on some of his other writings. Are we, therefore to conclude it to be "universally conceded," that neither the learned divine and politician, nor his friends venture "to utter a syllable in their defence?" Controversialists should be cautious of using weapons which cut both ways, and which may be so effectually turned against themselves.

But, although there may be many who thought, and who still think, the "Plea" possesses some degree of superiority, even in point of argument, and a high degree of superiority of style and manner of writing over the "Examination," it matters little, as they are all pronounced ignorant, and, of course, not competent to give an opinion on the subject. If they venture to "open their lips in defence of the 'Plea,'" they are modestly told—"they have not the least pretensions to biblical learning!" Poor Archdeacon Blackburne! you were before pronounced a superficial judge of theological controversy, and now it appears, on the same authority, that you had not "the least pretensions to biblical learning." The author of the "Plea," judging from the notes accompanying that performance, to say nothing of his other works, was thought, by some, not entirely destitute of "biblical learning;" but now we find, that he and his admirers, all those who presume to "open their lips in defence of the Plea," must be pronounced destitute "of the least pretensions" to this important branch of science. All must lie prostrate under this sweeping sentence. Let Christians, therefore, of all classes, the learned as well as others, who study the sacred writings, henceforth beware how they differ from the oracle of "biblical learning," of Essex Street chapel.

Extraordinary as some of the opinions and language I have quoted must appear to the impartial reader, he must prepare himself for what are still more extraordinary. The biographer adds, "The impression made by the *Examination*, on the ingenuous mind of the author of the *Plea*, was very considerable. Mr. Robinson was *stung to the quick*, by the grave, and *as his conscience must have testified*, the not unmerited rebuke of his unknown opponent. His friends urged him, his opponents challenged him to stand upon his defence;* or to fulfil his promise, that if ever he discovered his deception he would retract his error. *He resolved however to keep a prudent silence.*' To this uncandid, unjust and cruel attack on Mr. Robinson's integrity, I could, in complete refutation, produce ample evidence; but I have no occason to refer to any other evidence than that, extraordinary as it may seem, presented by the biographer himself, in the very page last quoted. "I do not intend," says Mr. Robinson in a letter to a friend, "to answer the anonymous examiner. HE HATH NOT TOUCHED MY ARGUMENTS: his faith stands on criticisms; and my argument is, that if the doctrine require critical proof, it is not popular, and therefore not divine. Yes, they will have the last word, and let them have it."—Is this, I seriously demand, the language of a man "*stung to the quick*," suffering under the severe "*rebukes of conscience?*" of a man, according to the injurious statement of Mr. B., possessing neither sufficient courage to defend his widely circulated opinions, nor sufficient honesty to fulfil his promise to the public "to retract his errors whenever he should be convinced of them;" and, therefore, with sneaking cowardice "prudently resolving to be silent?" No! such language is, on the contrary, that of the man unstung even at the surface, and whose conscience was without rebuke. I appeal, therefore, with confidence to every reader of common sense and common candour, whether I have not a right to pronounce Mr. Belsham's assumptions, so deeply affecting Mr. Robinson's moral character, entirely groundless, contradictory to the very plainest evidence, and, of course, most unwarrantable and inexcusable! They are, indeed, utterly inconsistent with the terms of respect, "ingenuous, worthy, excellent, &c." applied by the biographer to Mr. Robinson, and which are scarcely to be regarded, as he is at the very moment endeavouring to rob him of that character which ought ever to be deemed the most important, by the Christian more especially; a character of divine origin,—"the noblest work of GOD, AN HONEST MAN."

There are other parts of the chapter I have noticed, in which I conceive there are mistakes respecting Mr. Robinson and his admirers, too material to pass uncorrected; but I fear I have already intruded on your limits, if not on the patience of your readers. I must, therefore, defer the remainder of my strictures to another letter.

I conclude by observing, that whatever may be thought of my conduct in the present instance, I am conscious of having no other motives than the love of truth, and respect for the memory of a great and good man; of one whose character was thus briefly summed up by the friend of Mr. Lindsey, so often referred to by his biographer:—"ROBERT ROBINSON, one of the ABLEST and HONESTEST writers in the kingdom.*" I have, therefore, no apology to make for what I have written. If, whilst endeavouring to correct the errors of others, I should, inadvertently, have committed errors myself, no one, I hope, will, on their being pointed out, be more ready to acknowledge them.

---

* Who were these "challenging opponents?" If their challenges were in print, they are, by this time, hurried down the stream of oblivion. As Mr. Belsham does not mention them, some may be inclined to think they were, with the exception of Mr. Lindsey, Falstaff's "men in *buckram!*"

I remain, Sir,

Your constant Reader,

B. FLOWER.

P.S. The following extracts from Mr. Belsham's work, (p. 34 & 492) may serve to shew Mr. Blackburne's close attention to theology in general, and what is of the greatest importance, to practical theology in particular:—"Early in the summer of the year 1769, these gentlemen [the Rev. W. Turner and Dr. Priestley] met Mr. and Mrs. Lindsey, by appointment, at the house of Archdeacon Blackburne, at Richmond, where they passed some days together, in that unreserved and delightful interchange of sentiments, and in those free and amicable discussions, which would naturally take place among persons of high intellectual attainments, in whose estimation the discoveries of divine revelation held the most honourable place, and who were all equally animated with the same ardent love of truth, and with the same generous zeal for civil and religious liberty."

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Blackburne to Mr. Lindsey.

MARCH 1, 1756.

"When one sees what different opinions are founded upon the scriptures, by different heads, and none of them void of plausibility, I am strongly tempted to parody a striking passage in the gospels thus:—Except your charity exceed the Athanasians, Methodists, mystics and zealots of every sect, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven. O, my friend, what shall we do to unlade our hearts of the world, and to fill them with God, so as to do, think and say all to his glory? I am so far a mystic as to think this attainable, and am miserable, wretchedly miserable, in finding myself so far behind those who have already attained hitherto. Pray for me, dear Mr. Lindsey, as I do daily for you, that we may be really instrumental in doing some of that good which is well pleasing to God; and at least that this *ευδοκια* may receive no let, either from our indolence, or the incongruity of our doctrine or manners. O, what a glory to carry with us one soul to heaven for seraphs to rejoice over, and to raise the exultations of the heavenly host! What are all the cares, riches, pleasures or anxieties in the world compared to this! Teach me, for I know you can, how that frame of mind is to be put on, which must carry us to our utmost perfection in Christ. I am, with unabated love for you, the unworthiest of all your fellow-servants.

F. B."

---

* "The pamphlet mentioned above [the *Plea*] is the work of Mr. Robinson, pastor of a Baptist church and congregation at Cambridge; one of the ablest and honestest writers in the kingdom, and author of that excellent tract, entitled *Arcana*." — Blackburne's Works, vol. i. Life, p. 126.

John Goldie, of Kilmarnock.

Sir,

As your volume circulates in Scotland, I should wish to submit an inquiry or two, to your readers there, arising out of *Maty's Review*, vol. viii. for the year 1785.

In p. 282, is the following article of *literary intelligence*, said to be "extracted from a tour through Scotland, lately taken by an ingenious friend."

"*Kilmarnock.*—In this place is an extraordinary man, one John Goldie, a peasant's son, who first shewed his genius, by making a mill to grind corn, with a knife, and then a wooden clock. He published, some time ago, Essays 8vo. and just now hath brought forth a work, entitled *The Gospel Recovered*, in 5 vols. 8vo. in which he shews that Christianity is totally corrupted; and labours with extreme ardour and zeal, to overthrow the doctrines of predestination, original sin, the Trinity, &c. &c. &c. I take him to be a man of great natural powers. In many things he strongly resembles Thomas Chubb. The gentry in the neighbourhood who patronise him have very imprudently put into his hands the works of Morgan and other deistical writers, which has confused his ideas, and made him adopt some erroneous notions about the Mosaic system, &c. At present, indeed, he is a little out of the theologic line, and is preparing a great work to confute Sir Isaac Newton's philosophy, and restore the vortices of Descartes. You do not suppose that I think he will succeed in his attempt; yet I apprehend his plodding brain will bring forth several things that have hitherto escaped notice, and may be worth attending to. He appears to have a full conviction of the difficulty of his undertaking, and resolves to proceed with caution in it."

Now, Sir, permit me to ask, whether this singular man be living? or when he died? how far he proceeded in his philosophical project? what was the precise religious system laid down in "*The Gospel Recovered?*" whether he retained his religious sentiments to the last? and whether they made any impression upon his townsmen and neighbours?

I hope your northern readers will not think my questions idle, but believe me to be,

PHILO-SCOTUS.

On a General Association of Unitarians.

Warrington, 14*th Nov.* 1812.

Sir,

I read with pleasure the remarks of *Koinonos* in your Repository for September, (Vol. VII. p. 570) on the Plan of an Unitarian Association.

I agree with him that the union should commence between the members of each society, and from thence should be extended to district, provincial and national meetings. No other objection could possibly be made to the including of Scotland in the national meeting than the very great length of the journey from the remotest situations in that part of the island. It was a friend of mine who sent you the paper on which Koinonos has favoured the public with his remarks. My friend has for some time not only entertained the views which Koinonos embraces, but has put them into practice, so that he cannot be considered as clinging to the prejudices of an early education.

Koinonos allows the advantage of having persons to conduct the devotional exercises, and to take the lead in the instruction of Christian societies, whose previous education and present leisure enable them to make deeper and more accurate researches into Christian truth, and consequently better qualify them for the instruction of their fellow-christians. Whilst this is the case, the distinction between minister and people will be kept up, without supposing that there is any other superiority in the ministerial character than what arises from the superior qualifications of the minister, and from the superior information and improvement which his people derive from his faithful and useful ministerial services. But where, in consequence of the want of funds and the poverty of the members, provision cannot be made for a minister, let persons so circumstanced meet together, however few their number, and availing themselves of every assistance which they stand in need of, either for the devotional or the instructive part of the service, let them worship their Heavenly Father in spirit and in truth, and teach the pure, unadulterated doctrines of the gospel. From societies of this description, let such delegates be sent as the members may think most eligible. But I agree with my friend in thinking that where there is a minister to conduct the religious services of the congregation he should be one of the delegates, and that he should not be the only delegate. Some of the congregation, I think, should be deputed to act with him. One material object of the association, but in my opinion not the most important, is to provide the requisite funds for carrying on every object which may be favourable to the propagation of religious knowledge, and to the promotion of Christian improvement. The most useful part of the institution, I apprehend, will be to promote a spirit of religious inquiry, to generate a thirst for Christian knowledge in the minds of ministers and people, and to excite both to be active and zealous in the dissemination of every important religious truth among their friends and neighbours. I think all parties, both ministers and people, should put their hand to the plough, and I therefore wish that both should be included in the delegation. I should be sorry to see any classes excluded. I should therefore wish to see the bachelor, as well as the married man, thus actively employed in promoting the great cause of the gospel. I should wish to see the generous enthusiasm and activity of youth, as well as the sedater judgment of riper years, called into exercise in this great and glorious work.

The most useful part of the plan, I apprehend, will be found that of the congregations associated in classes for religious and theological conversation, and of neighbouring societies in district meetings. This, I apprehend, in many circuits, might be commenced immediately, and with very great advantage, without waiting for the arrangement of the more extensive associations which could not well take place till a considerable number of the smaller ones were established. With respect to the regulations for their internal government, experience would soon correct any thing which at the outset might not have been sufficiently considered. At the same time, the observations of the friends of free inquiry must be of considerable advantage, and I therefore hope that the Unitarian public will, through the medium of your valuable Repository, be favoured with the farther sentiments of the advocates of Christian truth on this subject.

A FRIEND TO CHRISTIAN UNION.

On the Letters of the "Daventry Pupil" and Mr. Belsham. [*Vol. VII. p.* 609 & 684.]

December, 21, 1812.

SIR,

Little as I am in the habit of wondering, being now in the vale of years, I must acknowledge myself astonished at reading the animadversions of your reverend correspondent, Mr. Belsham, in the last number of your Repository, [Vol. VII. p. 684.] on a letter addressed to you by *a Daventry pupil*, [ib. p. 609.] I could have had no idea that there was any thing so exceedingly wrong and offensive in candidly pointing out a mistake in the *Memoirs of Mr. Lindsey*, as to hurt the feelings of the author, and give a more than usual asperity to his language, little becoming the gentleman, and still less a professed disciple and minister of the meek and lowly Jesus.

Mr. B. is one of the last persons that should take offence at an attempt to correct a mistake of his own, who speaks of himself as having been egregiously mistaken through the greater part of his life, notwithstanding the distinguished advantages he enjoyed for the investigation of truth, in an institution conducted on a truly liberal ground, and whose time and talents are so zealously employed in correcting the dreadful mistakes of ninety-nine in a hundred of the Christian world.

Having had the pleasure of his acquaintance from the commencement of his academical course, and well knowing the amiable character he supported, and the general attachment he secured to himself in different situations by the urbanity and politeness of his manners, nothing but his own signature would have led me to suppose that the above letter came from his pen. What reflection was it upon Mr. B. that he should not have known the whole reason why Mr. Ashworth was not *actually* chosen by the Northampton congregation, though his sentiments were in unison with those of their late venerated and beloved pastor, Dr. Doddridge, by whom he had been recommended to that situation? The reason which the *Daventry Pupil* assigns, (to which I could add another probable one) I doubt not was just, and it was much "to the purpose." But, supposing it to be a mistake, it does not follow that what Mr. B. assigns was the *true* one; which implies a gross reflection upon the Dr. and his congregation, as well as upon Mr. Ashworth.

As to the other supposed mistake of the learned author of the Memoirs, concerning the comparative orthodoxy of Mr. *Gilbert* and Dr. D. I beg leave to remark, that Mr. B's objection to the testimony of his opponent, whatever it may have of wit, contains no solid argument. Supposing this *Daventry Pupil* to be upwards of seventy years of age, he was *twenty* "above fifty years ago," and surely a student of that age might be a competent judge of a minister's strain of preaching. But he rests his assertion not merely upon his judgment *then*, but upon printed sermons still extant. To his testimony, however, "I MUST add," notwithstanding Mr. B's ingenious comment on that phrase, my own. I was a student at Daventry during the life-time of Mr. Gilbert, and I occasionally officiated at Northampton after his death. Now, Sir, though I never heard him preach, yet from what I could not but hear from the people there concerning him, I am persuaded that, notwithstanding the respectability of his character, his public services were not popular, either in regard to matter or manner, nor such as to correspond with the taste of that party of Christians to which Mr. B. supposes him to have belonged.

As to what concerns Mr. *Hextal*, though it is true, Mr. B. "has not mentioned his name," every dissenter in or near Northampton, of sufficient age, would at once *know* what "independent church," was alluded to. It was right therefore, in my opinion, that a correct account of that affair should be given, and particularly to prevent the censure's being misapplied by strangers.

After all, Mr. Editor, (not to inquire what these things had to do in a Life of Mr. Lindsey,) I should not have thought the matters at issue of sufficient importance to have written to you upon them, had it not been for the check given by the spirit which Mr. B's letter discovers, to that free, good-humoured correspondence which is to be wished for, and in which you, Sir, as editor, are concerned. I cannot see any necessary tendency in Unitarianism to interrupt the wonted course of friendly and gentle feelings, to raise the tone, in speaking or writing, and to give its advocates a fancied place above the common standard of human intellect. Could I suppose these to be its legitimate offspring, I should have a very powerful additional argument against it. That there may be no dread of a challenge for every little difference as to facts or opinions, and that one loss may not be followed by another and a greater, the loss of argument by the loss of temper, is the wish of your obedient servant,

ANOTHER DAVENTRY PUPIL.

P. S. A friend of the late Dr. Price would ask Mr. Belsham, whether the choice of Dr. Priestley to succeed that gentleman at Hackney was owing to his not having been explicit in acquainting that congregation with his sentiments?

JOHN MILTON.

Unus Patronus bonæ causæ satis est.
EPISCOPIUS.

This wonderful genius towered above his contemporaries, as much in point of understanding as of imagination. His prose, no less than his poetical, works bear the stamp of true greatness. In going through them lately, we have taken extracts, which we shall lay before our readers in successive numbers: our end will be answered if we so far impregnate them with the spirit of this divine writer as to quicken them to the desire of conversing with him in his immortal works.

EDITOR.

No. I.

Acts of Grace.

He [Charles I.] twits them [the Parliament) with his "Acts of Grace," proud and unself-knowing words in the mouth of any king who affects not to be a God, and such as ought to be as odious in the ears of a free nation. For if they were unjust acts, why did he grant them as of grace? If just, it was not of his grace, but of his duty and his oath to grant them.

No. II.

Books.

Books are not absolutely dead things, but do contain a potencie of life in them, to be as active as that soul was whose progeny they are: nay, they do preserve as in a viol the purest efficacy and extraction of that living intellect that bred them. I know they are as lively and as vigorously productive as those fabulous dragons teeth; and being sown up and down, may chance to spring up armed men. And yet, on the other hand, unless wariness be used, as good almost kill a man as kill a good book: who kills a man, kills a reasonable creature, God's image; but he who destroys a good book, kills reason itself, kills the image of God, as it were in the eye. Many a man lives a burden to the earth; but a good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, imbalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life. 'Tis true, no age can restore a life, whereof perhaps there is no great loss; and revolutions of ages do not oft recover the loss of a rejected truth, for the want of which whole nations fare the worse. We should be wary therefore what persecution we raise against the living labours of public men, how we spill that seasoned life of man, preserved and stored up in books; since we see a kind of homicide may be thus committed, sometimes a martyrdom; and if it extend to the whole impression, a kind of massacre, whereof the execution ends not in the slaying of an elemental life, but strikes at that ethereal and sift essence, the breath of reason itself, slays an immortality rather than a life.

No. III.

Calvin.

We have lookt so long upon the blaze that Zuinglius and *Calvin* hath beacon'd up to us, that we are stark blind.

No. IV.

Catholic Faith.

Nothing can be to us catholic or universal in religion, but what the Scripture teaches: whatsoever without scripture pleads to be universal in the church, in being universal is but the more schismatical.

No. V.

Roman Catholic.

Whereas the Papist boasts himself to be a Roman Catholic, it is a mere contradiction, one of the Pope's Bulls, as if he should say, universal particular, a Catholic schismatic.

No. VI.

Chaplains.

The Scripture owns no such order, no such function in the church; and the church not owning them, they are left, for aught I know, to such a further examining as the sons of Sceva, the Jew, met with. Bishops and presbyters we know, and deacons we know, but what are chaplains? In state, perhaps, they may be listed among the upper serving men of some great houshold, and be admitted to some such place, as may stile them the servers, or the yeomen-ushers of devotion, where the master is too resty, or too rich to say his own prayers, or to bless his own table.

No. VII.

Charity.

As without charity, God hath given no commandment to men, so without it neither can men rightly believe any commandment given. For every act of true faith, as well that whereby we believe the law, as that whereby we endeavour the law, is wrought in us by charity, according to that in the divine hymn of *St. Paul*, 1 Cor. 13, *Charity believeth all things*; not as if she were so credulous; which is the exposition hitherto current, for that were a trivial praise, but to teach us that *Charity is the high governess of our belief*, and that we cannot safely assent to any precept written in the Bible, but as charity commends it to us. Which agrees with that of the same apostle to the *Ephes.* iv. 14, 15. where he tells us that the way to get a sure undoubted knowledge of things, is *to hold that for truth, which accords most with charity.*

Last of all, to those whose mind is to maintain textual restriction, *whereof the bare sound cannot consist sometimes with humanity, much less with charity*, I would ever answer, by putting them in remembrance of *a command above all commands*, which they seem to have forgot, and who spake it; in comparison whereof, this which they so exalt, is a petty and subordinate precept. *Let them go*, therefore, with whom I am loth to couple them, yet they will needs run into the same blindness with the Pharisees; *let them go therefore, and consider well what this lesson means, I will have mercy and not sacrifice;* for on that saying *all the law and prophets depend*, much more the gospel; whose end and excellence is mercy and peace: or if they cannot learn that, how will they hear this? which yet I shall not doubt to leave with them as a conclusion;—That God the Son hath put all other things under his own feet, but *his commandments he hath left all under the feet of charity.*

No. VIII.

National Church.

It is a rule and principle, worthy to be known by Christians, that no scripture, no, nor so much as any ancient creed, binds our faith or our obedience to any church whatsoever, denominated by a particular name; far less, if it be distinguished by a several government from that which is indeed catholic. No man was ever bid be subject to the Church of Corinth, Rome or Asia, but to the Church without addition, as it held faithful to the rules of scripture and the government established in all places by the apostles; which at first was universally the same in all churches and congregations; not differing or distinguished by the diversity of countries, territory or civil bounds. That church, that from the name of a distinct place, takes authority to set up a distinct faith or government, is a schism and faction, not a church. It were an injury to condemn the papist of absurdity and contradiction for adhering to his catholic Romish religion, if we, for the pleasure of a king and his politic considerations, shall adhere to a catholic English.

No. IX.

The Clergy.

Heretofore in the first evangelic times, (and it were happy for Christendom if it were so again,) ministers of the gospel were by nothing else distinguished from other Christians, but by their spiritual knowledge and sanctity of life for which the church elected them to be her teachers and overseers, though not thereby to separate them from whatever calling she then found them following besides, as the example of St. Paul declares, and the first times of Christianity. When once they affected to be called a clergy and became, as it were, a peculiar tribe of Levites, a party, a distinct order in the commonwealth, bred up for divines in babling schools, and fed at the public cost, good for nothing else but what was good for nothing, they soon grew idle: that idleness with fulness of bread, begat pride and perpetual contention with their feeders, the despised laity, through all ages ever since, to the perverting of religion and the disturbance of all Christendom. And we may confidently conclude, it never will be otherwise, while they are thus upheld undepending on the church, on which alone they antiently depended, and are by the magistrate publicly maintained a numerous faction of indigent persons, crept for the most part out of extreme want and bad nurture, claiming by divine right and freehold, the tenth of our estates, to monopolize the ministry as their peculiar, which is free and open to all able Christians, elected by any church. Under this pretence, exempt from all other employment, and enriching themselves on the public, they last of all prove common incendiaries, and exalt their horns against the magistrate himself that maintains them, as the Priest of Rome did soon after, against his benefactor, the emperor, and the Presbyters of late in Scotland, of which hireling crew, together with all the mischiefs, dissensions, troubles, wars merely of their kindling, Christendom might soon rid herself and be happy, if Christians would but know their own dignity, their liberty, their adoption, and let it not be wondered if I say, their spiritual priesthood, whereby they have all equally access to any ministerial function, whenever called by their own abilities and the church, though they never came near commencement or University. But while Protestants, to avoid the due labour of understanding their own religion, are content to lodge it in the breast, or rather in the books of a clergyman, and to take it thence by scraps and mammocks, as he dispenses it in his Sunday's dole, they will be always learning and never knowing, always infants, always either his vassels, as lay papists are to their priests, or at odds with him, as reformed principles give them some light to be not wholly conformable; whence infinite disturbances in the state, as they do, must needs follow.

No. X.

Common Prayer Book.

For the matter contained in that book, we need no better witness than King Edward the Sixth, who to the Cornish rebels confesses it was no other than the old mass-book done into English, all but some few words that were expunged.

No. XI.

Conscience.

Any law against conscience is alike in force against any conscience.

No. XII.

Royal Conscience.

The more our evil hap that three kingdoms should be thus pestered with one conscience.

The parliament, without any usurpation, hath had it always in ther power to limit and confine the exorbitancy of kings, whether they call it their will, their reason or their *conscience.*

No. XIII.

Constantine.

What harm the excess of hire brought to the Church, perhaps was not found by experience till the days of Constantine; who out of his zeal, thinking he could be never too liberally a nursing father of the church, might be not unfitly said to have either overlaid it or choaked it in the nursing. Which was foretold, as is recorded in ecclesiastical traditions, by a voice heard from heaven on the very day that those great donations and church-revenues were given, crying aloud, *This day is poison poured into the church.* Which the event soon after verified, as appears by another no less antient observation, *That Religion brought forth Wealth, and the daughter devoured the mother.*

No. XIV.

Creeds.

They object, that if we must forsake all that is *Rome's*, we must bid adieu to our creed; and I had thought our creed had been of the apostles, for so it bears title. But, if it be hers, let her take it. We can want no creed, so long as we want not the scriptures.

Mr. Strephon to Mr. Wright.

Dublin, Nov. 16, 1812.

Sir,

I have read as many of your excellent publications, these last four months, as time and opportunities permitted. I have long been in the same sentiments, am agreed with your Essay on open Communion, admire your labour of love in the supreme cause, and would rejoice to imitate it if strength admitted. I observe in the Monthly Repository of last May, your replies to some queries on open communion, by whom I know not. Have the goodness to permit me to trespass on your valuable time, to observe that many of your readers would gladly see your reply to the following question; viz, If some members of a congregation have heard other members of it deny the divine mission, miracles and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ; would the former, on seeing the latter come to his table, be guilty of a breach of Christian charity, in declining communion with them, as he who doubts is condemned if he eat, because he eats not in faith, for whatsoever is not of faith is sin. Paul, Rom. xiv. 23. Religious hypocrisy is of all other sins most abhorred in the sight of God, and most polluting to the conscience.

AN OLD UNITARIAN MINISTER,
OR, J. STREPHON.

Death-beds of Unbelievers.

Birmingham, *Nov.* 17, 1812.

SIR,

I chanced the other day to meet with a Sermon, preached and published some time ago by the Rev. John Evans, of Islington, upon the death of Mr. Stephen Lowdell (one of his congregation), in the preface to which is the following passage: "A celebrated atheist, distinguished for his parts and learning, was known through life to be afraid of *being left alone*, and when his physician assured him (at the age of *ninety-two*) that his disease was mortal, his only remark was, 'I shall be glad to find a hole to creep out of the world at.'" In order to apply this anecdote as a proof of the greater strength of mind, and consequent increase of happiness, to be derived from a belief of the existence of a Deity and of a divine revelation (for which purpose it is here introduced), I conceive it would be necessary to shew that it was in consequence of his disbelief upon these points, that the Atheist here alluded to, was affected with this weakness, and that the fear of being left alone could not be attributed to the silly tales of nurses, or the errors of early education; at all events, it would be necessary to prove that all who happily have no doubts of the existence of a Deity, or the truths of Christianity, are never affected by such fears as that of being left alone. Now I much doubt whether there are not many instances upon record, and within the knowledge of most persons, of the firmest believers being subject to foolish fears of the same kind, attributable to disease or the defects of education. If I am not much mistaken, the late Dr. Priestley always felt some degree of fear from being alone in the dark. The Rev. Gentleman has therefore I think been rather unhappy in the application of this part of his anecdote.

With regard to the second part of the story, which relates the manner in which he received the report of his physician that "his disease was mortal," so far from its being a *proof* that he would have looked upon death with greater firmness, or that his mind would have been in a happier frame had he been a believer, I really think that had this part of the story been related of a Christian, it might have been brought as a proof of the excellence of a belief which would enable a man to contemplate death so firmly—"I shall be glad to find a hole to creep out of the world at." I would therefore wish to impress upon the mind of the Rev. Gentleman by whom this is related to seek for other proofs of the excellent effects of a belief in Christianity, than in the weakness or unhappiness of those whose minds are unfortunately closed to its evidences; unless he is prepared to prove that this weak or unhappy frame of mind is solely attributable to their disbelief. But it is too much the fashion of many zealots of the present day to hold forth with a degree of apparent satisfaction (not betraying much Christian charity) the misery of that part of their fellow creatures who die unbelievers. A celebrated female writer in a recent work, has laboured all in her power to convince us that Hume's was a miserable death-bed. Her best friends, I am of opinion, could not wish her a greater happiness than that her mind at that solemn period may be as free from torment, and her heart from self-reproach, as Hume's was.

By inserting the above in your valuable publication, you will oblige

A CONSTANT READER.

Religious Penal Laws.

B——, *Dec.* 3, 1812.

SIR,

An idea I am informed prevails among some of the Protestant Dissenters in the country, that the late act in favour of religious liberty has completely done away all the penal statutes which affect their rights as a body, except the Test and Corporation Acts. As this mistaken notion may abate their zeal in promoting the object which the friends of civil and religious liberty propose to bring before Parliament in the course of this winter, it might prove serviceable to the cause, if one of your correspondents would have the goodness to point out distinctly the *deficiencies* of that act, and the penal laws affecting the rights of conscience, which still *remain* to disgrace the Statute Book.

I have sent you for insertion in your useful Repository, an extract from a letter lately received by me from a liberal clergyman of the established church, containing intelligence which must be highly gratifying to every advocate for the just rights of all classes of religious professors. In doing this, as it is entirely of a public nature, was sent to me to be communicated to my friends, and as I do not mention the name of my respectable correspondent, he will not deem it a breach of confidence and delicacy; and my wish to benefit hereby the cause which we have both nearly at heart, will I trust effectually plead my excuse,

A FRIEND TO UNIVERSAL LIBERTY.

Oct. 26, 1812.

MY DEAR SIR,

The Newspapers informed us some time ago, that the aggregate meeting of Roman Catholics in Ireland, had resolved to join in our truly Christian union for obtaining the repeal of all our intolerant statutes, thus proving to the United Kingdom, that they are as ready to *allow* to *others* complete liberty of conscience, as to *claim* it for *themselves*. I can with pleasure now add, that the Irish Protestants are at least equal to their Roman Catholic brethren in candour and liberality, and will concur with them next winter in addressing petitions to Parliament, that justice may be done impartially to all the suffering sects. On his return from Ireland a short time ago, the truly venerable ——— called on me, and from him I had the satisfactory information that in travelling from the south of Ireland, through Dublin to the north, he met Protestants of all denominations; but, numerous as they were, he found scarcely any who did not approve the gospel principle of religious liberty, and wish success to that cause which is soon to be pleaded by the Roman Catholics of Ireland.

In England much has been already done, and with good effect far exceeding our expectations. The Dissenters in London have joined their brethren in the country; and even the Methodists I hope are sensible, that to preserve the advantage lately gained by them, still more to gain that perfect liberty of conscience, to which they with others are entitled, it behoves them to support to the utmost of their power the attempt which will be repeated in the new Parliament, to extirpate intolerance to its lowest root. In this attempt I see no reason to doubt the universal concurrence of our English Catholics, and even new reinforcements may be expected from the increasing liberality of our churchmen. To this effect I am inclined to draw a favourable omen from the late vigorous and truly conscientious resolution of ——— to sign the Christians' petition next winter, and, as I understand him, to assist to the utmost of his power, by his active co-operation in the south. From his high character as an author and a man, his union with us cannot fail to produce considerable effects. Upon the whole, I trust you will feel as I do, fresh encouragement, fresh hopes of success; it may be rapid; it may be gradual, and even slow; but now, whether immediately, or after a prolonged struggle, complete success seems sure to be obtained.

Yours, &c.

On the Methodist Excommunication at Flushing.

Sir, *Jan.* 2, 1813.

The account given in a late number (Vol. VII. p. 650.) of the excommunication at Flushing, excited in me no small emotion: I felt for the honour of Methodism and of Christianity.

What, is there some latent principle in all ecclesiastical orders and constitutions, from the conclave of cardinals at Rome, to the conference of Methodist preachers at Leeds, that irresistibly inclines them, whenever there is a fair opportunity to restrict, to suspend, to excommunicate and persecute? Truly, so one would think from an attentive survey of what has been done, and is still doing, in every department of the vast hierarchial scale.

Will you permit me, Sir, through the medium of your publication to address a few interrogations and considerations to the managers of this antichristian business? The proper medium, I allow, is the Methodist Magazine; but I know well that its pages are closed to any remonstrances with the ruling powers in the kingdom of saints.

They adhere closely to the political maxim, That nothing which is at rest should be disturbed—and that there is to be nothing relating to disputes or controversies admitted, except it be their own oracular decision on the opinions of those "who *are not in the connexion.*"

Let me reason with these *great men of God*, or, as the Venetians are said to style their priests, *God's gentlemen*, on their own principles and professed plan of conduct. I would submissively enquire whether an exclusion from the Methodist Society, under the circumstances stated at Flushing, be not unprecedented and repugnant to the fundamental regulations on which the Society taken in the aggregate was originally formed?

Do not what are called "The Rules of the Society," published usually in a small pamphlet, and which were drawn up by Messrs. J. and C. Wesley seventy years ago, and supposed to be consented to by every member on admission, contain the *standing orders*? Where is there a law in this original code, that without the grossest chicanery can bear on the case of the people at Flushing? There is no belief in any speculative article of faith required, nor expulsion threatened to a man in these matters thinking for himself.

The only condition, as it is positively expressed, of admission into the society is, "having a desire to flee from the wrath to come," and the only condition of continuing in the society is, "manifesting successively that desire by refraining from the immoralities that are specified in these rules, and being found in certain devotional exercises therein enjoined." I do not understand that the Flushing heretics were discarded for any alleged immoralities, but solely on account of their having embraced the tenets of Unitarianism. If it were so, and this I must presume, they were excluded without any grounds existing in the original institute of Methodism. I know not what can be said to rebut this conclusion by the advocates of intolerance, except it be that these *luckless wights* of Unitarians do not come under the predicament on which persons are admitted and continued in the society, since they manifest by the errors which they have embraced that they no longer "have a desire to flee from the wrath to come."

They, however, who avow this sentiment never derived it from the luminaries of Methodism, and must have very lately received it from some other sources. The Rev. J. Wesley, himself, has asserted in his writings, not only that an anti-trinitarian may manifest a desire of escaping future misery, but that he may be a truly good man. In one of the numbers of the Arminian Magazine, published a few years before his death, he inserted an extract of the memoir of the life of that eminent Unitarian, Thomas Firmin. In introducing this extract he observed that he had formerly been inclined to think that a person who was unsound with respect to the doctrine of the Trinity could not be a converted or good man. But that now he thought differently, since the subject of the memoir was undoubtedly a pious man, though erroneous in the doctrine of the Trinity, and that there was *no arguing against facts.* I will answer for this being the sentiment contained in the magazine, if I have not given the identical words. These I should have quoted could I have had easy access to the document.

That man of superlative piety and devotion, the Rev. J. Fletcher, gives a decided testimony to the possibility of an Unitarian being in a state of grace. In his "Portraiture of St. Paul," though he laments the Unitarians, on account of the faint light in the peculiarities of the gospel system they possess; yet allows that they may be in one of what he calls "the saving dispensations," and therefore ought not to be treated with contempt and rigour, but borne with and gently led on to that state of light and purity which he denominates the dispensation of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. So the fathers of Methodism thought; are their sons degenerated, or are they wiser than they!

Will it be said that the discarded Unitarians fell under the ecclesiastical laws, not so much because they held erroneous opinions, as because they did not keep them to themselves, but endeavoured to propagate them amongst their brethren?

On this ground of defence, I would inquire of Mr. A. Seckerson, the legate apostolical, and of those by whom he was commissioned, whether it be an indispensible term of holding communion with the Methodists, that the members of society should refrain from instructing each other, and by removing what they apprehend to be false or imperfect views of sacred facts and doctrines, to build each other up in divine and scriptural knowledge? Or, whether they are required not to move the sixteenth of an inch out of the magic circle which Mr. Wesley's eight volumes of sermons and his notes on the New Testament, and Mr. Fletcher's works have drawn around them? If such terms of fellowship exist, will not a defence of Christian liberty come very awkwardly from our methodistical leaders, and will it not be with an ill grace that any of them condemn the pretensions to infallibility of the Church of Rome? Should it be said, as a dernier resort, that those members of the Methodist society, who do not approve of its restraints on this head are not deprived of Christian liberty, because they have the power of quitting it whenever they please,—I would ask whether the same plea might not be made use of to justify the most despotic states on earth? The subjects of these might possibly have it in their power to escape from their bondage by flight, but does that circumstance extinguish the charge of despotism; or do they who live in such states enjoy the advantages of one which is politically free?

If any of the advocates of methodistical disownment or excommunication, will condescend to take notice of these remarks, I presume, Sir, that you will not refuse them the privilege of conveying their sentiments in your miscellany. If they should bring forward any thing that has the shew of reason and argument I shall not be backward in paying it all due respect.

In the mean time, I exhort the expelled brethren contentedly to leave their quondam associates to "eat their own supper," whilst they themselves thankfully and joyfully partake of the rich and wholesome provision furnished them by the feast of reason and pure religion. I am, Sir, yours, &c.

SABRINUS.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

Mrs. Cappe on the late Mr. Cappe's Opinion of the Miraculous Birth of Christ.

Sir,

In a note annexed by Mr. Belsham in his interesting Memoir of my late excellent friend in Essex Street, to his account of the controversy in the Theological Repository, on the miraculous birth of Christ, (p. 235) he deduces an inference of which it is necessary that I should take some notice, and as I know of no medium through which I can do it with so much effect and propriety as that of your valuable publication, I request you will do me the favour to insert the following explanation.

The worthy author of this able and most valuable memoir, giving me full credit for not willingly concealing any thing which might tend to develope or establish important truth, concludes from my not having given any intimation to the contrary in "The Life of Christ," that Mr. Cappe never changed his opinion on that subject. This inference proceeds on the assumption, that "the narrative of the miraculous birth of Christ is placed (by the notes) "upon a par with the rest of the evangelical history." Now, Sir, in this assumption, I must beg leave to point out a mistake;—the notes, as far as I can understand them, do not enter at all into the controversy, or incline either to one side or the other. They do indeed demonstrate that the author never relinquished his belief in the authenticity of the controverted chapters, but this was far from involving in it as a consequence, that he never changed his opinion respecting the doctrine supposed to be contained in them. Not being aware that any such deduction could be made, I was far from feeling the necessity of guarding against it; but now, finding that in this I was mistaken, I consider it as a duty, incumbent upon myself, as the publisher of these notes, to state briefly, as far as I am acquainted with it, what was actually the progress of the author's mind on this intricate subject.

When the controversy of the miraculous birth was begun by Dr. Priestley, in the Theological Repository, Mr. Cappe most carefully studied the arguments on both sides, in connection with the question how far the chapters were genuine in which the doctrine was supposed to be contained? The first result was a still more decided belief in the truth of the doctrine itself, as well as in the authenticity of the disputed chapters, and he accordingly wrote a treatise, stating the arguments at considerable length which had led to this conviction. This treatise he laid aside for some time, according to his usual habit, that he might return to the subject again at a future period, as free as possible from prejudice, or the influence of preconceived opinion. And here may I be allowed to pause for a moment, in order to remark respecting the character of all the scriptural investigations of my late honoured husband, that however new, or even improbable, at first sight, many of the results may have appeared, and little attention as some of them may hitherto have excited; even among the most enlightened and liberal, partly from the retired life of the writer, who mixed little with the world, and whose talents and character could not therefore be duly appreciated, that they were always the result of the most diligent and careful examination, and that of a pious, calm, unprejudiced mind, whose sole aim was to elicit truth, and not to throw out at random any crude and undigested opinion. I know indeed that there are characters of the very first order for talents, for moral excellence, and for every Christian virtue, who regard it as their duty to publish immediately, unmindful of consequences, whatever may at any time occur to their minds as a subject of useful inquiry, and that such was the late very eminent Dr. Priestley. The great object was in both the same, although the mode of pursuing it differed so widely; which of the two methods will eventually be most effectual in overcoming the reign of prejudice and long established error, let others judge; both no doubt will have their distinguished use in the counsels and final results of that infinite wisdom, which, in one immense survey, sees the end from the beginning, and which, for reasons to us inscrutable, has permitted the corruption of divine truth, and suffered darkness for a season to overshadow the nations.

But to return from this digression. On a second and last, and perhaps a more careful examination, though he always retained his conviction of the authenticity of the chapters, Mr. Cappe changed his opinion respecting the doctrine. He thought that taking into our account, and allowing their due weight, to the peculiar ideas, customs and phraseology of the Jews, the narrative would allow of being so explained, as to admit of a solution in which nothing miraculous appeared, except the means employed to calm the mind of Joseph, to remove the suspicions of his supposed wife's fidelity, and to assure him that the child about to be born was his own son. Upon what principles he was led to this conclusion, as they are grounded upon a critical investigation of the original terms employed by the historian, I do not feel myself competent fully to explain; yet it may not be useless or unacceptable to transcribe his remarks upon the scripture meaning of the term "HOLY SPIRIT," the misunderstanding of which, in Mr. Cappe's apprehension, has been the principal foundation of the opinion usually maintained respecting this passage.

"The terms *Holy Spirit*, and other similar terms, are often used in scripture to signify,

"1. Something more than common, even though it be not supernatural, e. g. Gen. xli. 38. Exod. xxxi. 3. xxxv. 31, &c. Numbers xxvii. 18. 1 Sam. x. 6. compare with it verse 7 at the end; x. 10. xi. 6. xix. 20, 23. 1 Chron. xii. 18. Dan. iv. 8, 18. v. 11—14. vi. 3. perhaps also Judges iii. 10. vi. 34. xiii. 25. xiv. perhaps also Micah iii. 8. In this use of the term there is nothing foreign to the genius of the Hebrew language, in which *spirit* signifies power, and strength, and stability, in opposition to frailty, and feebleness, and impotence; in which *Holy Spirit* and other like phrases, signify God; and in which the name of God annexed to any object or quality, signifies that there is in it something great or extraordinary.

"The Spirit is said in Holy Scripture as Judges vi. 34. xiv. 6. to come upon a person when he does some noble, rare, and worthy action; in like manner as the wicked spirit is said to enter into Judas when he was guilty of some great and notorious wickedness, John xiii. 27, in which however there was nothing supernatural. (*Wilson's Christian Dictionary, by Simpson*, p. 611.)

"2. The gracious presence and blessing of God, though in the ordinary course of his Providence; e. g. Psalm cxxxix. 7. 1 Sam. xvi. 13, 14, &c. compare particularly verse 14 at the end. Here again perhaps might be mentioned chap. x. 6. compare verse 7. Psalm li. 11. And it is observable that what in Luke xi. 13, is *Holy Spirit*, in Matt. vii. 11, is *good things*. It might be added, that what in Luke i. 35, is *the Holy Ghost*, &c. in verse 28, is *highly favoured, the Lord is with thee*; and in verse 30, is *thou hast found favour with God*, of which, the promise of a Son, and the future greatness of that son, were the proof. To receive the spirit is to receive power, whether natural or supernatural. Compare in the original, Acts i. 8, with Heb. xi. 11, and with Matt. i. 20, at the end, verse 21 at the beginning, and with Luke i. 35, 36, 37, Gen. xviii. 14.

"3. Extraordinary divine communication, suggestion, movement, impulse, prophecy; e. g. Nehemiah ix. 30. Isaiah xlviii. 16. Ezek. xi. 5. 24. Comp. xiii. 3. Zech. vii. 12. perhaps 1 Tim. iv. 1. 'Now the Spirit speaketh expressly,' &c. may refer to the prophetic spirit in Jesus Christ. See Matt. xxiv. 4, 5, 23, 24, 25. Mark xiii. 5, 6, 21—23. Luke xxi. 8.

"4. Scripture,—Scriptures of the Old Testament,—accommodable prophecy,—prefiguration; e. g. *In spirit*, Matt. xxii. 43: *By the Holy Spirit*, Mark xii. 36: perhaps signify, according to the conception of Matt. and Mark, *under divine influence, by divine suggestion in prophesying*; that is, uttering words capable of being applied, and which are actually applied, by apostles and evangelists, to events and their circumstances of other times. For the Jews seem to have conceived the contents of all their sacred books to have come from divine influence and suggestion; and particularly to have ascribed the Hagiographa to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. (See *Maimonides in Mor. Nev.* or chap. xlv. or *Lewis's Antiq.* V. iv. 213:) and it is not improbable that it was through this medium, and not directly, that these terms were used (if indeed they were so used by them) to denote divine communication; for Luke xx. 42, instead of *in spirit*, has, *in the Book of Psalms*, i. e. 'in the scriptures of the Old Testament, which you acknowledge for the word of God; in the Hagiographa, which you say were written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.' Acts i. 16, it is, *the Holy Ghost spake by the mouth of David*; in verse 20, *it is written in the Book of Psalms*; chap. xxviii. 25. *the Holy Ghost spake by Isaiah the prophet*; i. e. it was foretold by David the prophet; there are in the prophecies of Isaiah, words applicable to this matter; it was of the Holy Spirit that some did, and some did not believe, agreeing to his suggestions, to the premonition, or the prefiguration of Isaiah.—There was nothing in this unbelief to overturn the faith of those who had believed the gospel, because it had been foretold, (as Paul believed,) that it should be so:—there was found in that prophet what was applicable to this circumstance; what prefigured it. In Heb. iii. 7, ix. 8, 1 Cor. xi. 13, *words taught by the Holy Ghost*, probably is 'language of the Old Testament' (See *Grotius* in loc.). In Luke xxiv. 25, "that the *Prophets*," &c. might have been expressed by *Spirit of God*, *Holy Spirit*, &c.

"It is true that *the Spirit*, *my Spirit*, &c. does signify sometimes God, or some attribute of God; and, indeed, so it might be explained here; and any of the four preceding interpretations might have been put upon either phrase "of the spirit," or "of God."

"Now all such interpretations of 'holy spirit,' as carry in them the idea of miraculous birth being set aside, which of the four above enumerated shall we adopt for this passage? Any of them would be true: and perhaps one might be taken, which would carry along with it the rest; and to such a sense the evangelist, as it appears to me, directs us. The pregnancy of Mary was "of the Holy Spirit," being according to the scripture,—an event so modified and circumstanced, that it might appear to have been described by an ancient prophet. For this implies in it, that it was something more than common; and probably, also, that it was in consequence of divine care and blessing."

Having thus collected the different senses which this phrase bears in scripture, Mr. Cappe draws some general reflections, which appear to my mind so important, that I shall transcribe them for the Monthly Repository, sending you the first, along with this letter. In reference to the interpretation briefly stated above, which he gave to this passage, Mr. Cappe observes "1st, that if the truth of the interpretation be admitted, it must be allowed as a reasonable inference in this, as in innumerable other instances, that the most obvious is not always the real sense of scripture. With respect to any book in a foreign and ancient language, there are many causes which may put distance between our ideas and the conceptions of the writer. The most obvious import of ancient terms and phrases, is that which approaches nearest to the import of like terms and phrases in the language of the reader. This is the sense which they will first suggest to his mind; but if difference of climate or lapse of time or any civil revolution has introduced a difference into modes of thinking or of living, it is by no means certain that by this road we shall be led to the true meaning of the writer. To an interpretation of a passage in any foreign or ancient author, it is not an objection to be sustained, that it is not the most obvious meaning: nevertheless, it may be what his terms would have first suggested to his countrymen and contemporaries, though not to us. In respect to us, the true interpretation may be remote and latent, and apparently unnatural. Such in scripture, I apprehend it often is: and so it will remain, unless the time should ever come when we shall have arrived at a perfect knowledge of the opinions and habits of the Jews, and of the idioms and principles of their language, and when theological follies, instilled into us by our nurses and our preachers, shall have ceased to warp and pervert our minds. Till then, if we would not delude ourselves, we must be content, by a patient consideration of the occasion and the context, as well as of the terms in question, and on diligent and accurate observation and inquiry concerning the usage of the language in respect of those terms, to ascertain, as we are able, the sense of such passages as have appeared obscure, and should learn to acquiesce in a reasonable, though it should not be thought an obvious and natural one.

"Much of the language of scripture is formed upon conceptions derived from the law and history of the Jews; on ideas of creation and destruction; of life and death and resurrection; of similitude and analogy between God and men; between spiritual and worldly powers; between entrance into life and entrance into a religious communion; between the operation of divine laws in the system of the universe and the decision of human judicatures, &c."

I shall be happy if this communication should be acceptable or useful to any of your readers; and am, with sincere wishes for the continued respectability of the Monthly Repository,

Sir,
Your obliged Servant,
CATH. CAPPE.

On the Use of Vocal and Instrumental Music, in Public Worship.

Sir,

I have lately been led to reconsider the question, Whether the use of instrumental music is allowable, in aid of the singing, in public worship? and my examination for my own private satisfaction, has led me to the knowledge of some facts, respecting the history and grounds of the employment of vocal and instrumental music in public worship, with which I was not previously acquainted. It may not be useless to insert some remarks on this subject, in your very useful work, and I shall feel obliged by your doing so.

To those who look upon our Lord Jesus Christ, as (under Him who appointed him) the sole lawgiver of the Christian Church, it will be quite sufficient to determine the above question, if he have given any instruction respecting it; but it must be obvious to every one who reads the New Testament, that he has said nothing which at all directly affects the inquiry, since he has given no directions whatever respecting the mode in which public worship is to be performed. All he requires is, that we should worship the Father in spirit and in truth. If the use of music (vocal or instrumental) in public worship, is inconsistent with this most important direction, he virtually forbids it; if not, he has said nothing which bears upon the subject one way or other.

If, however, the apostles of Jesus have given us any specific directions, respecting the mode of performing public worship, and the parts of which it was to be composed, considering them as in such cases acting under the authority of Jesus himself, I should regard those directions as equally binding with the immediate directions of their Lord. But so far from having done this, I believe it is impossible to derive directly from their writings, any thing beyond those general principles, which ought, in all cases, to guide us in our services, but which cannot furnish us with specific regulations. There are, it is true, in 1 Cor. xiv. some specific regulations for the church at Corinth, respecting the employment of their spiritual gifts in their public assemblies; they, it appears, having greatly perverted those gifts; but these can scarcely be strained into directions for Christian churches in general, though the spirit of some of them may be most advantageously employed. It is clear, from that chapter, that at the public meetings of the Christians, individuals, under the direction of the spirit, prayed and gave thanks, and prophesied, taught, or exhorted; but we have no ground to believe, that this was done in such a manner as to afford direct apostolical sanction to our regular routine of prayers and sermons. I do not mean to intimate, that this is *contrary* to apostolical directions; but simply that we are without any such directions, to authorize us in our modes of conducting public worship: and also without any clear apostolical examples to sanction them. Whether we shall, at stated times, begin to pray to God in our public services, or wait till the spirit of devotion directs the act of prayer; whether we shall employ unpremeditated prayer or pre-composed forms; whether the minister alone shall offer up prayers as the organ of the congregation, or all share in that part of the devotional exercise; whether the sermon shall be extempore or written, &c. these, and as far as I can see, every thing else respecting the order and conduct of public worship, are all left to be determined by the views and experience of the worshippers. That all should be done decently and in order, that all should be done for edifying, and that the expressions of devotion should arise from the heart, and be guided by the understanding, are all very valuable general principles, but afford us very little specific direction on the subject: we appear to be absolutely left to be guided by the dictates of experience, and by the known laws of the mind, whether scientifically or practically ascertained. The religion of Jesus is a religion of freedom. If forms of any kind had been enjoined, they would of course have constituted a part of our duty; but as the gospel was designed for all ages and nations, our great head has most wisely left these, in almost every instance, to be regulated by the spiritual necessities or mental progress of his followers. All they have to do, is to take care that their means of piety be guided by the *spirit* of his religion.

With respect to singing, (whether alone or accompanied with instrumental music), I see no reason in the New Testament to conclude, that it was *designed* by Jesus or his apostles to be introduced into public worship as a part of public devotion. This position may at first sight appear to some of your readers as altogether unfounded; and so it would have done to myself before I examined the New Testament and the practice of the early Christians, with a specific view to this object; but the result is what I have stated. The grounds of the opinion, and of some other conclusions respecting devotional music, I shall proceed to shew, only premising, that I do in no degree mean to say, that the employment of chorus-singing in public worship is contrary to apostolical precepts and practice, but simply that it is altogether without any direct support from them.

To clear the way a little, I shall first consider the import of those words in the New Testament which are connected with my object; and next examine in their order the different passages in the history and epistles of the apostles which have any reference to the use of music, in connexion with devotion; and then the other passages of the New Testament which bear upon the inquiry.

Αδω (*ado*) is the verb which is most clearly appropriated to the act of *singing*. It is continually employed in the Septuagint as the representative of *shur*, the generic force of which appears to be, "*to regulate*, and thence to regulate the voice in singing, *to sing*, *to utter musically*." (See Parkhurst.) It is employed in Eph. v. 19. Col. iii. 16. Rev. v. 9. xiv. 3. xv. 3. Schleusner gives ᾳδω a second meaning, viz. *to praise, to celebrate*, and refers to the two above-mentioned passages in Paul's Epistles, and to Hos. vii. 2. Jer. xxx. 19.* but it is greatly to be doubted, whether there is any sufficient authority to suppose that it means praising in any other way than by singing. Ωδη (*odé*) is the correspondent substantive, and is well expressed in English by *song* or *ode*. It denotes a verse or system of verses designed to be employed in singing.

‘Υμνεω (*humneo*) according to Schleusner, signifies to *repeat a hymn* (hymnum dicere) to *sing a song*, to *celebrate*, to *praise*, to *give thanks* either by a song or hymn, or in any other way. Parkhurst says the verb is used intransitively, to *sing* or *recite a hymn*, and transitively, to *celebrate* or *praise with a hymn or hymns*, to *hymn*. In the Septuagint it is three times used for *eude*, (to confess, to praise, to give thanks,) twice for *elεl*, (to praise,) twice for *eshir*, (to sing,) twice for *zεmεr*, (to sing with music, to hymn,) and twice for *rεnεn* (to sing or utter joyfully). The substantive ‘υμνος, a *hymn*, from which the verb comes, has its origin in ‘υδω to *celebrate*, to *sing*;

---

* In the passage in Hosea there is nothing in the Hebrew corresponding to the word: in Jeremiah, the word is used for *thude*, praise or thanksgiving. With two exceptions, which do not respect the inquiry, it is in all other instances used as the rendering of *shur*; and it is, I should suppose, most likely, either that the LXX found in their Hebrew copies of Jer. xxx. 19. a word denoting praise by singing, or that they considered, from the connexion, that the import of our present reading is praise by singing.

and it was appropriated by the Greeks to signify a composition in measure, to celebrate the praises of their gods, and designed, as all such verses were, to be sung. But as to the verb, it is clear from the circumstances here stated, that the leading force of it in the Septuagint is, to *praise* or *celebrate;* and that the *manner* in which this was done, (whether by singing or repeating a hymn, or in any other way,) is not expressed by it. Among the Greek prose writers it appears to have been very seldom used with any specific reference to singing, but most commonly in the sense of praising or celebrating.

Ψαλλω (*psallo*) is, I believe, the only other verb employed in the New Testament in the present connexion. According to Schleusner, it signifies, 1. to touch, to strike with a gentle motion: 2. to sing with lutes or other instruments of music, to strike the harp or lyre; in this signification it answers in the Septuagint to the Hebrew *nεgεn*, to play upon a musical instrument, or to sing with instrumental music, and to *zεmεr*, to sing with or without instrumental music: 3. to sing with the voice alone, and particularly to sing hymns, to praise and celebrate God.* Parkhurst, after quoting the same meaning as the first of Schleusner, says, 2. "to touch the strings of a musical instrument with the finger or plectrum;" "and because stringed instruments were commonly used both by believers and heathens in singing praises to their respective gods; hence, 3, to sing, sing praises or psalms to God, whether with or without instruments;" and he refers to passages referred to in the note on Schleusner. It appears to me clear, that these learned lexicographers have rather too much acted the part of commentators. I believe that there is no authority for supposing that ψλλαω among the Greeks, (or *psallo* among the Latins,) was ever employed in reference to singing, exclusively of instrumental music, before or during the apostolic age*; and, on the other hand, we have thoroughly good reason to believe, that this word as used by heathen writers, is exclusively appropriated to the employment of instrumental music. Eustathius [in Il. χ. p. 1378, 52,) as quoted by Wetstein, (on Eph. v. 19.) is very express. "In these things," he says, "we are to remember, that there does not appear to be any difference between *ᾳδειν* and *μελπειν*; but *ψαλλειν* differs from both, as he manifests, by saying, 'at supper the harlots *ᾳδουσι και ψαλλουσι**, and one of them leads off, and the rest sing together.' The ode is a composition arranged for singing. But *ψαλλειν* is by means of musical instruments, and particularly what is peculiarly termed the psaltery." Aulus Gellius† (Att. Noct. xix. 9,) says, qui *canerent* voce, et qui *psallerent*; those who sing with the voice and those who play. Cyrill‡ (see Schleusner) speaks of *ψαλμος*, as a musical composition, when it is played melodiously upon a musical instrument, suitably to harmonious words. *Psallere*, says Crellius, (Eth. Christ. lib. iii. c. 9.) "is to sing with the voice, and at the same time to strike some musical instrument.§" H. Stephens (Thesaurus L. Gr. tom. iv. p. 694.||) explains the word, as

---

* For this last meaning Schleusner refers to Rom. xv. 9. 1 Cor. xiv. 15. Eph. v. 19. James v. 13. which are the only places in which it is used in the New Testament. I know of no authority for supposing that before or in the time of the apostles, ψαλλω (*psallo*) ever was used to signify singing exclusively of instrumental accompaniments. There may be instances in which the praise is the chief feature to which the reader is directed; but that it signifies praise in general, without any reference to the manner of it, or even in reference to praise to the direct exclusion of instrumental music, is, I believe, utterly incapable of proof. In Rom. xv. 9. we have a quotation from the Psalms, where the original is *zεmεr*, which Buxtorf, (Lex. Chald. Talm. & Rabb.) explains, *psallere. psallendo laudare et predicare, canere,* (to play or sing with instruments, to praise and make public by such means, to sing;) and in that passage, the object clearly is, not the manner of publickly praising, but the public praise itself. Nevertheless, though the manner may be of no consequence as to the spirit of the declaration, yet the declaration itself implies the manner. Buxtorf informs us that *zεmεr* is rendered in the Targum by *sh$^{\varepsilon}$bεch* to praise, except in some places in the Psalms, where it is retained; but *sh$^{\varepsilon}$bεch* is used in the Targums for all the Hebrew words denoting praise, whatever manner of it they express, unless this was particularly the writer's intentions, and as to the Psalms, the authority of the Targumist is in this case of no value, since his commentary was written several centuries after Christ, and is "in the corruptest Chaldee of the Jerusalem dialect." Where the manner of praise is not the object, but the praise itself, I will not say that we should do wrong in translating *psallo* by some general word denoting praise, since we have no word of corresponding force in the language; but I think I am fully justified in maintaining, that if the manner of praise be in any way brought into view, we cannot exclude the *accompaniment* of instrumental music, which at least *psallo* always does include.

---

* Hesychius (see Schleusner,) in explaining *ψαλλειν* only gives *ᾳδειν ᾳσματα*, to sing songs, *τιλλειν* and *κινειν*. He has therefore no reference whatever, to what indisputably was the meaning of the word, in and before the apostolic age, when used in connexion with music. This is rather a remarkable circumstance, but I think it is to be accounted for, by the period in which Hesychius lived. He is placed by some in the 6th century, and not earlier than the end of the 4th. By the use of *ψαλλω* in connexion with singing psalms, even if unaccompanied with instrumental music, it appears gradually to have lost, among the early Christians, the original appropriation of it to playing or singing with instruments: and this was greatly aided by the dislike which was commonly entertained to the use of instrumental music, during the third and some following centuries, owing, in part, to its having been employed in the temple service among the Jews, and to other circumstances which will be hereafter noticed. Hence it is not improbable that in the time of Hesychius, *ψαλλω*, as commonly used, had ceased to have any reference to instrumental music; and as his authorities are lost, we are left to suppose that he must, in this case at least, have employed only such as would not aid us in our present inquiry, which does not respect the use of the word in the later writers, but at the time of the apostles.

* It should be noticed, that this is the very combination of words employed by the apostle in Eph. v. 19. The circumstance is important. The opinion of Eustathius, in reference to a case in which theological opinion was out of the question, must appear to most, absolutely decisive. He flourished at the end of the 12th century. The early part of his life, he spent at Constantinople, the place of his birth; and he was afterwards Archbishop of Thessalonica. His commentaries on Homer "are very voluminous, and frequently illustrate the text; but they are principally valued by grammarians, for the great assistance they afford in understanding the Greek language"

† A learned grammarian who flourished in the middle of the second century.

‡ Bishop of Alexandria at the beginning of the fifth century.

§ I shall have occasion, hereafter, to cite the whole of the excellent passage from which these words are taken: excellent, though, in some respects, decidedly against those views which these papers are designed to state

|| Stephens introduces his remarks thus,—"Metaphor. Paul in Epist. ad

employed in Eph. v. 19, to signify, "striking the harp or lyre, singing to the stringed instruments; for (he continues,) it is properly spoken respecting the touching of stringed instruments, as *psallere* also among the Latins. Thus Horace says *Psallimus et luctamur Achivis doctius unctis;* and again, *doctæ psallere Chire.*" Stephens also refers to Aulus Gellius as above quoted. After mentioning some more general meanings of ψαλλω (such as to move, to shake,) he states that not only the chord is said ψαλλεσθαι when it is touched and moved, but any one ψαλλεται to whom we sing with instruments, to whom we play on the harp, who hears any one playing or singing with instruments. If the learned reader will consult H. Stephens on the derivatives of this verb, he can scarcely fail I think, to come to the conclusion, that among the Greek writers in general, (excluding only those who lived long after the apostolic age,) the constant force of the word, when applied to music, was playing upon instruments, or (at most) singing with instruments. And I believe the same may be said with confidence as to the use of the word in the LXX. They have, it is true, frequently employed it as the translation of *zεmεr* (to sing, with or without musical instruments) as well as of *nεgεn*, (to play on instruments, or sing with them,) but as they must understand the force of their own language, I can see little room to doubt, but that they employed ψαλλω as the translation of the former of these verbs, only where they considered it as denoting singing with instruments. And I am inclined to think, that if the learned reader will consult Trommius for the use of this word and its derivatives in the Septuagint, and will take into account, what as clearly appears from H. Stephens was the invariable use of it among the heathen Greeks, he must come to the conclusion that the Alexandrian translators employed it, with little, if any, exception, to denote playing on instrumental music, or singing with it.—Ψαλμος (*psalmos*), a psalm, properly signifies, says Schleusner, 1, a touching, a striking, the striking of a stringed instrument, the sound of the same: 2, the musical instrument which is struck, the harp: 3, a regular song, composed artificially in numbers, and with rhythm, fitted both for the human voice and for musical instruments, a song, a hymn. This word is especially employed in the New Testament, in reference to the collection of Psalms in the Old Testament. Parkhurst gives, 1, a touching or playing upon a musical instrument: 2, a psalm, or sacred song or poem, properly such a one as is sung to stringed instruments.

N. B. I have just seen, in Mr. Yates's sermon at the opening of the Unitarian Chapel in Glasgow, a reference made (in a note) "to the remarks of an anonymous writer on the meaning of the word ψαλλω, in the New Testament." Before the close of my communications on the subject, I hope to avail myself of the information which is probably contained in the late publications respecting it in Glasgow. If the conclusions of

---

Eph. c. 5. λαλουντες—τῳ κυριῳ, canentes et psallentes Domino in corde vestro: id est, citharam seu lyram pulsantes; fidibus canentes: proprie enim," &c.

the anonymous writer, as to the force of ψαλλω, should be similar to my own, our independent agreement, will be satisfactory, probably, to both of us.—Of Mr. Y.'s sermon, my cursory perusal will only allow me to say, what is very obvious, that it is manly, appropriate and impressive: and I trust that it will not only lead the minds of many in North Britain, to consider the grand points of the Unitarian controversy, but that it will call the attention of some of our opulent Unitarians, to the pecuniary difficulties of the Glasgow congregation, which they may effectually remove without risk or injury to themselves, and thus contribute in (I am persuaded) no unimportant way, to diffuse the knowledge of the FATHER, THE ONLY TRUE GOD, and of Jesus Christ whom he has sent.

L. C.

Jan. 4, 1813.

[The writer next proceeds to consider the passages in the N. T. in which the foregoing words are employed, and at the close of the letter he draws several inferences from the examination, respecting the authority which those passages afford for the use of music (vocal and instrumental) in devotional exercises. But the great length of his paper prevents the completion of it in this Number.]

REVIEW.

Still pleas'd to praise, yet not afraid to blame.—POPE.

ART. I. *Memoirs of the late Reverend Theophilus Lindsey, M. A. including a Brief Analysis of his Works, together with Anecdotes and Letters of eminent Persons, his Friends and Correspondents: also a General View of the Progress of the Unitarian Doctrine in England and America. By Thomas Belsham, Minister of the Chapel in Essex Street.* 8vo. pp. 568. 14s. Johnson and Co. 1812.

MR. LINDSEY must be allowed a distinguished place amongst the English Reformers, whether we consider the importance of the doctrine which he embraced, avowed, defended and promoted,—the ability, zeal and perseverance with which he maintained the principles which his judgment and piety led him to adopt,—the memorable sacrifice, by which he proved his sincerity, and his conviction of the supreme value of the Unitarian doctrine,—or the various virtues which adorned his lengthened life. His personal history is, besides, inseparably connected with the late extraordinary revival of Unitarianism in England, which in some cases may be traced, and in most may be justly attributed, in no small degree, to his example, writings and generous efforts, public or private. Few individuals, therefore are fitter subjects of biography than Mr. Lindsey; and fortunate is it for his reputation, that he has obtained a biographer who thoroughly understands his character, whose long and close friendship with him qualifies him to describe the qualities of his head and heart, whose own personal history is in some points similar to that of the revered confessor, and whose talents can ensure lasting attention and respect to the portraiture of excellence, which his feelings have prompted him to place before the public. In thus expressing ourselves, we mean to bestow no complimentary language on the dead or the living. Mr. Lindsey is beyond the reach of flattery, and unmerited encomiums on his successor would only redound to the discredit of our pages, which, we trust, the experience of several years has convinced our readers that we would not knowingly devote to any purposes besides those of truth and justice.

In taking up this copious volume for review, we are not a little puzzled in determining how we can best present the reader with a specimen of its rich contents: we believe, upon the whole, that we shall discharge our duty most faithfully and completely, by following the biographer chapter by chapter, and making such extracts as comport with our limits; introducing here and there an observation, but reserving our more general remarks for the conclusion of the article. Having given, in our former volumes, biographical sketches of Mr. Lindsey and of his excellent partner, in his active and useful life, [See vols. iii. 617, 637.—iv. 1, 34.— vii. 109.] we do not think it necessary to follow our author in the entire and regular succession of his facts and dates.

Mr. Lindsey's mother, whose maiden name was Spencer, was distantly related to the Marlborough family, and previously to her marriage had lived upwards of twenty years in the family of Frances, Countess of Huntingdon, he himself was named after his godfather, Theophilus, Earl of Huntingdon, the son of the abovementioned lady, and the husband of Selina, Countess of Huntingdon, so well known as the zealous and liberal patroness of Mr. Whitfield and the Calvinistic Methodists.

" With this very respectable lady Mr. Lindsey lived many years in habits of friendship. And though, after his secession from the established church and the public avowal of his theological principles, all personal intercourse was for many years suspended, yet when Mr. and Mrs. Lindsey, in the summer of 1786, called upon Lady Huntingdon at Talgarth, in Wales, they were received, as he expresses it in a letter to a friend, " most graciously, as usual." Not only did she direct that every possible attention should be shewn them in their visit to her academical institution in the neighbourhood, but she earnestly pressed them to prolong their stay. With her old and much respected friend she had much serious conversation; and seemed particularly impressed with a hint which Mr. Lindsey threw out, in reference to a dear and only surviving son, of the safety of whose final state her ladyship entertained the most painful apprehensions, that possibly the state of future punishment might be only a process of severer discipline, and that the greatest sinners might ultimately find mercy. And when they parted she took an affectionate leave of them, and gave them her kind, maternal benediction, expressing, at the same time, her hope of meeting them in a better world. " Some good I hope, is done," says Mr. L. to his correspondent above referred to, where much is intended by this praiseworthy lady, who has, for full forty years, devoted her fortunes, time and labours to promote what she believes to be the truth: though I cannot but hope it will be a place for more rational inquirers after she drops into her grave." This venerable lady was at that time "turned eighty, but hale and sensible for that age." And though she might for a moment be soothed by a glimpse of hope of the ultimate restoration of a darling child, it was not to be expected that Mr. Lindsey's conversation would make any permanent impression upon her mind. He afterwards speaks of his aged friend as "still in the depths of mysticism and methodism, though she was become more moderate towards those who held different opinions." Nor does it appear that any material change ever took place in Lady Huntingdon's religious views, though the abuse of her generosity by some persons in whom she had placed a confidence which they did not deserve, made it necessary for her, in some measure, to restrain her munificence, and gave rise to a report that she had deserted the methodist connexion." Pp. 2, 3. Note.

Under the patronage of Lady Betty and Lady Ann Hastings, of the above-mentioned noble family, young Lindsey was placed at the grammar school at Leeds, then under the care of the Rev. Mr. Barnard; a gentleman of great eminence both for learning and piety, who devoted himself to the honourable and arduous duties of his profession, and *to whose superior talents and exemplary assiduity his grateful pupil was wont to ascribe, under Divine Providence, not only all his literary attainments, but almost all that was honourable and right in his personal character*. (P. 34.) This pleasing fact, so creditable to Mr. Lindsey, deserves also to be recorded in honour of his tutor, and as an encouragement to the teachers of youth to reckon confidently upon the success, in many instances, of their faithful labours, and particularly of their virtuous examples.

Prepared by the instructions of such a master, Mr. Lindsey, in the 18th year of his age, was admitted at St. John's College, in Cambridge, May 21, 1741. Here he soon attracted such notice and respect, that he was recommended to Dr. Reynolds, Bishop of Lincoln, as a tutor to his grandson, whom, at an early age, he sent to the university. Of the pupil, still living, we have the following interesting sketch:

"Mr. Reynolds, after having finished his education at the university, was taken by the late Lord Sandwich as his private secretary to Aix la Chapelle, where he remained during the negociation of the celebrated treaty, which takes its name from that city. After his return to England, declining the engagements of public life, he retired to his estate at Little Paxton, in Huntingdonshire. There he still resides, and amidst the high estimation in which he is universally and deservedly held, both for his public and his private virtues, he justly regards it as not the least of his honours to be known as one of the earliest friends and warmest admirers of the venerable Theophilus Lindsey.

"'I recollect,' says this gentleman in a letter with which he favoured the writer of this memoir, 'that Mr. Lindsey excelled in College exercises; that he was singularly pious; that he attended the chapel prayers, and monthly received the sacrament. His manners were mild and gentle, and his conversation was of a serious turn, but agreeable, and sought by his fellow-students. I have reason to believe that he obtained the highest honours on taking his degree, I mean Wranglership, but this I cannot positively assert.'" Pp. 5, 6 and Note.

In April, 1747, Mr. Lindsey having taken his degrees with high reputation, was elected a fellow of St. John's College; and having been ordained by Dr. Gibson, the Bishop of London, was, in the 23rd year of his age, presented to a chapel in Spital Square, London, by Sir George Wheeler, at the recommendation of Lady Ann Hastings, sister-in-law to the Baronet. Through the same interest he was, in a short time, invited, as chaplain, into the house of the Duke of Somerset, by whom and his accomplished lady, better known as the Countess of Hertford, he was treated with the liberality and affection of friendship. After the decease of the Duke, he continued some time in the family of the Dutchess, and at her particular and earnest request, accompanied her grandson, Lord Warkworth, the present Duke of Northumberland, to the continent, where he spent two years with his noble pupil. In reward of this service, the Earl of Northumberland presented him, on his return, to the valuable rectory of Kirkby Whiske, in the North Riding of Yorkshire; whither he hastened, declining a proposal of his patrons to attend Lord Warkworth to Eton as his private tutor, and commenced parish minister. In this situation he continued about three years, during which time he formed the acquaintance with the family of the celebrated Archdeacon Blackburne, which had so considerable and happy an effect upon his future life. He married in 1760, Miss Hannah Elsworth, the step-daughter of the archdeacon, after having, at the request of the Huntingdon family, resigned the living of Kirkby Whiske for that of Piddletown, in Dorsetshire. The character of Mrs. Lindsey has been sketched in this work with a glowing pencil by her long and close friend, Mrs. Cappe. [See Vol. VII. pp. 109—118.] She had peculiarities which were sometimes unpleasant to strangers, but they arose wholly from that ardent temperament and decision of character which fitted her to be the help-meet of a confessor and reformer. Mr. Lindsey himself described her as one "quæ quoque currentem incitat." P. 12, & *Month. Mag.* for Dec. 1808.

While he resided at Piddletown, Mr. Lindsey's first doubts arose concerning the doctrine of the Trinity, and here he began to meditate his retirement from the church; but his design was overruled for the present by the plausible considorations which he has so ingenuously stated in his Apology. In the year 1762, the prospect was opened before him of high ecclesiastical preferment: the Earl of Northumberland was sent over, as Lord Lieutenant to Ireland, and the place of chaplain to his lordship was offered by his consort to Mr. Lindsey, accompanied with a request that he and Mrs. L. would reside with them in the vice-regal palace till some valuable preferment should be obtainable. The acceptance of this offer would no doubt have led to an exalted station in the church of Ireland: "Dr. Dodgson, who accepted the appointment which Mr. Lindsey declined, was soon advanced to the bishopric of Ossory, from which he was afterwards translated to that of Elphin, where he died a few years ago." P. 15.

To the minds of Mr. and Mrs. Lindsey, the attractions of friendship were stronger than those of fashion, wealth and power; and soon after their refusal of the above tempting proposal, they effected the exchange of the living of Piddletown for that of Catterick, in Yorkshire; in every respect inferior, except in the opportunities which it afforded of cultivating the society of many valuable friends, and particularly of the venerable Archdeacon Blackburne. [See *Mrs. Cappe's Memoir*, Vol. VII. p. 110.] In the bosom of select society and in the midst of affectionate parishioners, Mr. Lindsey seemed to have attained the summit of philosophic happiness. He was a finished pattern of a good parish-priest; and Mrs. L. was the guardian, instructor and benefactress of her neighbours. But both the retirement and the converse which Mr. Lindsey had courted served to pave the way for the great and, at first, painful change which distinguished his life: his scruples concerning the worship of the church increased, till at length he relieved his conscience by a voluntary and magnanimous secession from his living, with all its benefits.

He had satisfied himself after his first doubtings, with considering the Trinitarian forms in the liturgy as "a three-fold representation of the One God, the Father, governing all things by himself and by his son and spirit," and under this view had brought himself to subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles, on his removal to Catterick. Of this prevalent and specious scheme, Mr. Belsham says,

"This, which is usually called the Sabellian hypothesis, and which differs only in words from the proper Unitarian doctrine, was advanced by the learned Dr. Wallis, Savilian professor of mathematics at Oxford, and well received by the University, in opposition to the hypothesis of three infinite minds, maintained by the celebrated Dr. Sherlock, which underwent a public censure. The professor states his opinion in the following terms, in reply to the objection of the Unitarians, that three persons were three Gods.

"'This reasoning,' says Dr. Wallis, 'is grounded on this silly mistake, that a divine person is as much as to say a divinity or a God, when indeed a divine person is only a mode or respect, or relation of God to his creatures. He beareth to his creatures these three relations, modes or respects, that he is their Creator, their Redeemer, their Sanctifier; this is what we mean, and ALL that we mean, when we say God is three persons. He hath those three relations to his creatures, and is thereby no more three Gods than he was three Gods to the Jews, because he calleth himself the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob.' See Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 7, 1693, apud Lindsey's Apology, p. 227. The learned professor might have spared his supercilious reflection upon the understandings of his Unitarian brethren, whose only error consisted in taking common words in their common acceptation. Is Dr. Wallis's doctrine that which still prevails in the learned University? If so, the pure Unitarian doctrine is much more extensively diffused than many of its most zealous advocates imagine. Happy would it be for the cause of truth, if, when error is detected and discarded, the language of error were discarded with it." P. 23. Note.

(To be continued.)

OBITUARY.

The Rev. Jabez Hirons.

Died at St. Alban's, Herts, Dec. 21, 1812, the Rev. JABEZ HIRONS. He was born there, July 11, 1728, and had his grammar learning partly under a respectable clergyman in Leicestershire, partly under Dr. Aikin, at Kibworth, in the same county. For his academical education he was placed with the excellent Dr. Doddridge, at Northampton, where he spent five years. In 1750 he assisted, and in 1751 succeeded, Dr. Clark, in the charge of a dissenting congregation in his native town. He was invited in 1770, to be the minister of a respectable society at Dudley, in Worcestershire, but declined the invitation, and continued at St. Alban's to the day of his death, when he had sustained the pastoral relation in one place for nearly sixty-two years*. It is a memorable and almost unparaleled circumstance, that this congregation was under the successive care of only two ministers for upwards of a century†.

During a life and a ministry protracted beyond the accustomed period, it was the lot of Mr. Hirons to witness painful changes in his neighbourhood and connections. But his private and his public labours were rendered useful to several—to many who, like him, are now gathered to their fathers, and to some who yet survive. Had his characteristic modesty permitted, he might have said, with Mr. Orton, who was one of his tutors at Northampton, and whom he, in some views, resembled, "I hope many aged persons have been edified by my services, and not a few young people trained up in sentiments of wisdom and piety." His desire of doing good was particularly gratified with reference to a large and very interesting class of the rising generation—the children of the poor. A valuable charity-school which he visited with parental vigilance and unwearied zeal, is among the best monuments to his memory: it was instituted by Dr. Clark; and of the young persons whom it has educated there are those on whom lasting impressions of religion have been made by the instrumentality of Mr. Hirons.

---

* The following sentences are extracted from a pathetic and interesting sermon, entitled, "*The Old Man's Calendar*: a Discourse on Joshua xiv. 10. Delivered in the first Parish of Hingham, in America, on the Lord's Day, August 26, 1781, the birth-day of the Author, EBENEZER GAY. 2d Ed. London, printed 1783."

"Lo, now, my brethren, I am this day fourscore and five years old——a wonder of God's sparing mercy! Sixty-three of these years I have spent in the work of the ministry among you——I am the third in the pastorate of this church."——p. 34.

† Dr. Clark's immediate predecessor was the Rev. Jonathan Grew, a native of Atherstone, in Warwickshire. (The Nonconformists' Memorial, 2d Ed. Vol. iii. 341, 342.) Whether Mr. Grew was the first minister of the congregation at St. Alban's is somewhat doubtful. Whom he succeeded the writer cannot at this moment ascertain.

His ministerial services were serious and devout. In his discourses he aimed to be intelligible and practical. When his life drew to its close, he was fond of preaching on two texts which shewed what were his general views of Christian doctrine, and what the subjects most congenial to his mind: the former had much affected him in his early days, in consequence of his hearing it repeated by a pious, but afflicted person in humble circumstances; it is the last verse of the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans: "For of him, and through him, and to him are all things, to whom be glory for ever. Amen." The other is the eighteenth verse of the fifth chapter of the second Epistle to the Corinthians: "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation." His prayers, both in the family and in public, were solemn, appropriate, pathetic, and have been noticed for their excellence, not only by his brethren in the dissenting ministry, but by clergymen of the established church.

In his literary and intellectual character he was superior to many persons of more showy parts and of less self-diffidence. There is reason to believe, that for a large portion of his life he was in the habit of contributing to one of the oldest and most respectable of the periodical publications. Of general and especially of theological and historical knowledge, he possessed no inconsiderable stock.

An habitual regard to God, and a strong sense of his own dependance and obligations, were visible in his conversation and behaviour; and he cordially accepted for himself, and earnestly recommended to others, the great salvation of the gospel. The scriptures he interpreted, as became a Protestant, by the scriptures; neither admitting *infallibility* to exist in any human uninspired being (not even in his revered tutor) nor assuming it for himself. His opinions on some disputed points were perhaps at nearly an equal distance from those which, justly or unjustly, are regarded as the extremes of theological sentiment among professing Christians. But he honoured persons of every denomination, provided he had reason to consider them as sincerely benevolent and pious; and, in return, he was highly esteemed by all who were themselves estimable. Never was a man more generally or more deservedly respected, in his sphere, for his unaffected candour and catholicism, for his upright, peaceful, blameless and consistent deportment, and for his readiness to do good to *all* men, as he had opportunity.

His benevolence was self-denying as well as extensive; his disposition extremely generous and grateful. In the duties of domestic life he was a pattern to believers. To young persons his manners were particularly conciliating; and he had much pleasure and some felicity in exciting and satisfying their thirst for knowledge. There were instances in which he was honoured with the guardianship of orphans, to whom he manifested all the tenderness and wisdom of a father.

His compassionate heart felt deeply for his friends under their afflictions: nor, amidst his own, did he remit his endeavours to serve them in their most valuable concerns. Though "faint," he still "pursued:" though the shadows of his evening lengthened, he still laboured till he was overtaken by the night of death: though the infirmities of a feeble frame tended to depress his spirits, his confidence in God never forsook him; and his end was peace and hope.

A few years after his settlement at St. Alban's, the happiness of Mr. Hirons was essentially promoted by his union in marriage with Ann, second daughter of Dr. Clark. In her indeed he found a most affectionate companion, and a most prudent adviser. He bore the loss of her in the autumn of 1804, with exemplary submission to his God and Father; but the event left a strong impression on his heart; and it became evident that one of his dearest earthly ties was rent asunder. On Dec. 29, 1812, his remains were interred, amidst many marks of esteem and sorrow, in the same grave with her's, in St. Peter's Church-yard: and the grateful respect entertained for his memory, was further shewn in the large concourse of people who attended to hear his funeral sermon, which was preached, Jan. 10, 1813, by Mr. Kentish, on *the honours and consolations of age*, from Philemon, verse 9: "Being such a one as Paul the aged."

Jeremiah Wrigley.

April 27, 1812, died in the 73d year of his age, at Barnbydon, in Yorkshire, JEREMIAH WRIGLEY, late of Thorne. He was many years a Methodist, during which time he became an Universalist. He was one of the first who embraced the Unitarian doctrine when introduced at Thorne. On becoming an Unitarian, he left the Methodists and associated with a few other persons who entertained rational views of Christianity, whom he greatly assisted in carrying on meetings for mutual instruction and the worship of the one God. Though placed in humble circumstances, his ardent love of truth, amiable spirit and consistent conduct did honour to the Christian profession. He bore his last sickness, which was severe, with much patience and calmness: he felt the animating hope of the gospel: his only fear was lest he should discover any feeling inconsistent with resignation to the will of God.

R. W.

INTELLIGENCE.

An Account of Mr. Wright's Missionary Tour in the North-west, extracted from his Journal.

To the Secretary of the Unitarian Fund.

Wisbeach, *Dec.* 2, 1812.

Dear Sir,

Having finished my mission in the North-west, I send you the following account of it. This journey employed me 82 days, in which I travelled about 1000 miles and preached 74 times. I will first give a brief account of the places where I preached, and then make some general remarks, and notice particular matters to which I am anxious to engage attention.

In passing through the country to the intended scene of my mission, I preached at the following places, viz. at

1, *Peterborough*, to a small, attentive audience.

2, *Leicester*. Here I had a very good congregation, for a week-day evening. I was requested to spend a Sunday in Leicester, when I go that way again.

3, *Melbourne*, in Derbyshire, in a large room, pretty well filled with serious hearers.

4, *Hinckley*. I preached here three times: the largest congregation was estimated at 500 persons.

5, *Birmingham*. Having but one evening I could spare for preaching in this town, at the request of Mr. *Little's* congregation, it was agreed I should preach in Mr. *Little's* place. We had a very good congregation.

Staffordshire.

I was twice in this county in the course of my journey, and preached at the following places, viz.

1, *Wolverampton*. Here we had a larger congregation than had been expected, as a number of persons of other religious denominations attended. Our friends in this town want a minister.

2, *Coseley*. The congregation here is pretty large. We had some friends from Dudley. Though I called at Dudley, and spent a few hours with my worthy friend Mr. *Bransby*, I could not be there in an evening.

3. *Dalliston*. I preached in a Calvinistic meeting-house, which is at present unoccupied. About 150 persons attended, among whom were several Methodist preachers. This was the first time Unitarianism had been heard from a pulpit in this place. There are a few persons favourable to it, and it would be well if an occasional lecture could be established in Dalliston, by the neighbouring Unitarian ministers.

As I was going down, I could hear of no opening for my preaching at Newcastle-under-Line, or in its vicinity; but whilst in Cheshire, I obtained such information as induced me to visit Staffordshire again, when I preached at

4, *Newcastle*, in a meeting-house belonging to the New Connection of Methodists, to about 200 people, among whom was a Methodist preacher and a Catholic priest. The congregation was very attentive. The Methodists, who were so liberal as to lend us the place, were previously informed that I was an Unitarian missionary, that they might not be surprised at hearing me preach a plain Unitarian sermon.

5, *Hanley*. This town is situated in the midst of the potteries, a very populous district; there are several Unitarians in Hanley; and a people I heard of at *Lane-end*, who are likely to become such. I preached in a Baptist meeting-house, which is at present unoccupied, and had about 160 very attentive hearers; among whom was a Methodist preacher and two Calvinistic preachers.

CHESHIRE.

This county was one of the principal objects of my mission; of course I devoted as much time as I could consistently spare to it. The following are the places where I preached, viz,

1, *Chester*. Here I preached twice, and had the pleasure of enjoying the edifying society of my esteemed friend and brother missionary, Mr. Lyons, and several of his people.

2, *Kingsley*. The congregation here consists, chiefly, of poor people; they heard me with deep attention. They furnish one among many modern proofs, that Unitarianism is capable of becoming the religion of the lower classes in society.

3, *Kelsall*. In a farm house, on a Tuesday in the afternoon, I delivered a discourse to a small assembly of attentive hearers.

4, *Tarvin*. On the evening of the same day, in a detached part of this parish, consisting of humble cottages, situated on the edge of Delemere forest, I preached to a crowded assembly of poor people, who seemed to drink in the word as the thirsty earth does the rain that descendeth upon it.

5, *Stockton-heath*. Here I preached in a barn, fitted up as a meeting-house, by a people called Quaker Methodists. There was a person present, a wild enthusiast, called a Revivalist, who stood before me to resist me. Just after I had commenced my sermon, he began to speak, but was stopped and I went on. As soon as I had concluded the discourse, he began, but was desired to be silent till I had finished the service. When I had finished it he began in prayer; but one of the leading Methodists who belong to the place, rose and said, *that* man belonged not to them, and had no authority there; made a liberal remark, respecting the sermon they had heard, and desired that there might be nothing disorderly, and that the congregation would immediately depart. The people in general, I suppose we had 150 hearers, departed; a few, however, remained behind, and I was informed he, the Revivalist, endeavoured to pray down my sermon, intreating the Almighty the people might believe nothing I had said.

6, *Partington*. The congregation here was small; I had some Calvinists to hear me.

7, *Knutsford*. The preaching here was on a Thursday morning. I had the pleasure of meeting at Knutsford several of our brethren in the ministry, from different places, and several gentlemen, zealous friends of the Unitarian cause, from Warrington, Manchester, &c. After the service we dined together, and spent the afternoon in a very edifying manner.

8, *Congleton.* As great pains had been taken to make my preaching known, we had the meeting-house pretty well filled; many of my hearers were persons of other religious denominations.

9, *Dean-Row.* I preached here on a Wednesday, in the middle of the day; the people who form this congregation, live so distant from the place, and are so much engaged in business, that it is difficult to collect them, excepting on a Sunday: however, we had a respectable company of attentive hearers.

10, *Cross-Street.* This is a small village. I preached on a Tuesday morning, to a small, respectable audience.

11, *Hale.* I preached in the afternoon of the same day at this place, and though the people had to come, most of them, a considerable distance, in an incessant and heavy rain, we had the meeting-house about half filled.

12, *Stockport.* Here I had a pretty large congregation; and afterwards spent the evening with a company of friends, in which much ardour in the cause of truth, Christian zeal and affection were discovered.

13, *Hyde.* In this place, I spent a most happy day. Several persons accompanied me from Stockport, and as I had not another day to spare for *Duckingfield*, where there is an Unitarian congregation, the minister of that place and a number of his friends met us at *Hyde.* We had preaching in the morning (it was on a Thursday); after the service, a large party dined together. It was something like a public association. The afternoon was spent in a way highly calculated to cherish Christian affection, increase zeal in the glorious cause in which we are engaged, and to promote every liberal and pious feeling. I preached again in the evening, the place was crowded, I suppose there were five or six hundred hearers, many of them persons of different religious sentiments, and all deeply attentive. After the evening service we had a large party together, for two or three hours, and the time was spent in edifying conversation.

I was under the necessity of declining an invitation to *Platt*, where there is an Unitarian congregation, not having a day but what was engaged by previous appointments.

LANCASHIRE.

Deeming this a county highly important to the Unitarian cause, I determined to devote to it all the time and attention in my power. I preached at the following places, viz.

1, *Paradise Street, Liverpool,* to, I suppose, about 700 people. I should have preached there again, but a week-day service was not thought eligible.

2, *Renshaw Street, Liverpool.* The congregation here seemed thin, for the size of the chapel; but it was in an afternoon, and congregations are usually thin at that time in large towns. There might be 250 people.

3, *Warrington.* I preached here five times; was always well attended; even the week evening congregations were large. I had much pleasing and edifying intercourse with the respectable minister of the congregation (Mr. Broadbent) and many of his friends; both he and they did all they could to accommodate me and promote the objects of my mission.

4, *Risley*. Here I preached on a Tuesday, in the middle of the day, and though it was in the harvest-time, and the people either farmers, or persons engaged in labour, the meeting-house was nearly filled with a deeply attentive audience.

5, *Ormskirk*. The meeting-house here was nearly filled; the hearers consisted of people who maintain very different religious systems.

6, *Preston*. A minister is wanted in this place. The meeting-house had been shut up for nearly six months. I preached twice. The largest congregation consisted of about 150 persons.

7, *Chorley*. I preached twice in this place: the meeting-house was well filled both evenings. I was told many strangers attended.

8, *Bolton*. I preached here three times; had very good congregations; the largest I estimated at 500 persons. This congregation is and has long been very completely Unitarian. The great attention paid to the children and youth in this place cannot fail to be productive of much good. The first evening I spent here was to me very interesting. I met several of our brethren in the ministry whom I had not seen before, and was edified by their conversation. The last was very animating; I spent it with the minister and a company of gentlemen belonging to the congregation.

9, *Walmesley*. The meeting-house here was, not long ago, saved from falling into the hands of Calvinists, by the judicious advice which a neighbouring minister gave the congregation, and the laudable exertions of a private gentleman, Mr. P. Baron, who went over and read sermons, and conducted the religious service, which preserved the place and congregation till they procured a minister. I preached twice; the place was filled; it holds about 400 people.

10, *Heapfold*. This is a hamlet about a mile and a half from Bury. Mr. Allard, the minister at Bury, delivers an occasional lecture here; at his request I preached it for him; it was well attended. At this lecture a gentleman was present who has lately left the Calvinists, and is now a zealous Unitarian. After the lecture, he requested I would preach in his house the next evening, which is situated in a place called

11, *Catshole*, in Middleton parish. This I agreed to do, and had a pretty good audience. After the service Mr. Baron gave notice that I should preach at his house, a few miles from Bolton, on the Saturday fortnight following. As soon as he had done this, a gentleman, a Calvinist, rose and said, "Will Mr. Wright then preach from any text that is given him?" I answered, "I will; what is the text?" He said, "The passage in Isaiah, *His name shall be called the Mighty God*, &c." I said, "I will then preach from the *whole* of that passage." Before the time came, hand-bills were circulated throughout the neighbourhood, and it was found necessary to remove the preaching, for the accommodation of the company, to the

12, *School-room on Cockey Moor*, which is sixty feet long and thirty wide. This room was well filled; many Calvinists besides the proposer, I was told, attended. Some murmured, but the people seemed generally satisfied. I preached another evening in this large room, and though the notice was short, it was nearly filled.

13, *Cockey Moor Chapel.* I preached here for *Mr. Bealey*, by his request and that of the leading people of his congregation. Mr. Bealey was the most intimate friend of the late Dr. Barnes. He had contemplated strict Unitarianism as a frigid, dry, philosophical system, which would diminish devotional feeling and love to Christ; but, after the deepest examination, he has given up his former views and is lately become avowedly an Unitarian, on the true evangelical ground; he now views Unitarianism as the very doctrine of the gospel, and greatly rejoices in it. He declares his former fears to have been totally unnecessary, and that strict Unitarianism, so far from diminishing, increases love to Christ and devotional feeling. He is considered by all our friends, and very properly, as an important accession. His long standing, considerable learning, and high worth of character, with the deliberate manner in which he has pursued his inquiries, must render him highly valuable to us. I preached in his place to, I suppose, 500 people. With Mr. Bealey's conversation, the piety, zeal, and affection with which he talks on theological subjects, I was both edified and delighted.

Rochdale. To this place I was invited by both parties of Unitarians; for a great part of the people who formed the congregation of the late Mr. Cooke are now Unitarians, and have been recently dispossessed of the chapel erected for him, called Providence Chapel. I preached on the Sunday morning in the

14, *Presbyterian Chapel, Rochdale*, which was well filled. As it had been anticipated that it would be too small for the rest of the day, the loan of

15, *Providence Chapel, Rochdale*, had been obtained. I preached in it in the afternoon, to, it was estimated, 1000 people, and in the evening, though it was dark, rainy and very dirty, to seven or eight hundred. I had much pleasing conversation with our friends of both parties, and I hope an union will be effected between them. Mr. Lyons has been with them the last two Sundays. They want a minister, and if they can obtain a suitable one, a most respectable congregation will be established. Rochdale presents an important and extensive sphere of usefulness; a minister placed there would find openings for preaching in the country below it, in Rozendale, a district which I regretted I had not time to explore, but where I understand there are many persons favourable to Unitarianism.

16, *Manchester.* I had to regret I could spend so little time in Manchester, and that it was not possible for me to be a Sunday there. I preached two evenings in the meeting-house in Cross Street; the congregation was estimated the first evening at 700 people, the other at a thousand; some estimated them higher, some lower. I had proposed preaching the last evening at Mr. Hawkes's place; but this was given up merely because it was supposed it would not contain the people who would attend. I shall never forget three evenings I spent in Manchester; the first we spent at an inn, for the sake of accommodating a large party. The other two evenings, Mr. Johns, (a gentleman to whom the friends of the Unitarian cause are under great obligations for his various exertions to promote it,) had the goodness to accommodate us with a large school-room. At these social meetings, a large display of intelligence, of christian affection, and ardent zeal in the cause of Unitarianism, of genuine Christianity, which has the illumination, virtue, peace and happiness of the whole world for its object, gladdened our hearts, and the growing prospect of its success caused us to rejoice together.

17, *Dob Lane.* Here I preached four times; the place was generally filled with very attentive hearers. The congregation is in a very good state. They have a library for the use of children and youth, and have been in the habit of holding conferences, and there are several young men in the congregation of considerable promise.

18, *Oldham.* There are several Unitarians in this town; but there had been no Unitarian preaching. The first time I preached at Oldham, I had a room crowded with attentive hearers. The second time, my friends had hired the theatre for me to preach in; but some persons had threatened the proprietor with I know not what painful consequences if he suffered me to occupy it; so he begged to be freed from his bargain, and he was freed. I preached in a room, as before, which was filled. The Methodists were so alarmed that they sent to a distance for one of their more popular ministers, to preach the same evening I should be there. I advised our friends to hold a meeting regularly among themselves, and do what they can; this I hope they will do. The Unitarians at Oldham left the Methodists a few years ago and became Universalists. They then corresponded with our friend, Mr. Vidler. He sent them some Unitarian books, which were imprisoned for a season, no one daring to read them; they were, however, at length liberated, and have produced important effects.

19, *Blackley.* Here I preached one evening; the meeting-house was well filled with very attentive hearers.

20, *Monton.* On the fifth of November, in the morning, I preached here; we had a very good congregation. Being a day of leisure, friends from Manchester and other places met us; we had a public dinner and a large company; the afternoon was spent with christian affection, in an edifying manner.

21, *Stand.* At this place, as well as in the other villages where I preached, I was gratified with the number and close attention of the hearers.

22, *Chowbent.* This congregation, like that at Bolton, was one of the first that openly avowed strict Unitarianism in Lancashire. I preached here four times; all the congregations were numerous; the largest was estimated at 1000 persons. We had very pleasant parties of friends together at the house of our worthy friend, Mr. Sanderson, and the evenings were spent in a manner highly satisfactory to me.

WESTMORELAND.

In this county I could spend but a few days. I preached in two places in *Kendal.*

1, The Presbyterian meeting-house, three times; the congregations respectable and very attentive: and

2, In the Unitarian Baptist place of worship twice, which which was well filled both times. I was much gratified with the christian intercourse I had with friends of both parties. I learned from Mr. Kay, an elder of the Unitarian Baptists, that religious inquiry and knowledge are making progress in various places north of Kendal; he very properly keeps up a correspondence with persons in different parts, who were his religious friends before he became an Unitarian.

3, *Kirkby Lonsdale.* There is one Unitarian here; but there had been no Unitarian preaching. I preached in a room, which was very well filled, and the people were attentive. Having begun the business for them, I expect our Unitarian Baptist friends at Kendal will keep up an occasional lecture here.

I intended, in the outset, to have extended this journey into Yorkshire, but found so much employment in Cheshire and Lancashire as made it quite impracticable.

The preceding narrative is merely an outline, a very compressed account; I have intentionally made it as short as I could, consistently with my design of giving a general view of where I have been, and what I have been doing. I must beg leave to add a few general remarks and observations.*

(*To be concluded in our next.*)

Manchester Quarterly Meeting.

Manchester, *Jan.* 20, 1813.

The Christmas Quarterly Meeting of Ministers, generally denominated Presbyterian, in Manchester and its vicinity, was held at the chapel in Cross Street in Manchester, on Dec. 30, 1812. Twenty-one ministers were present, whose number was increased at the dinner, which was provided at the Bridgewater Arms, by a considerable accession of lay gentlemen. The service in the morning was introduced by the Rev. Mr. Dean, and Mr. Johns preached from 2 Pet. iii. 15th and 16th verses. *Platt* was added to the list of places where the Quarterly Meeting is to be held in succession. In the evening, there was a service in the Unitarian chapel in Mosley Street, which was introduced by the Rev. William Allard. The Rev. Joseph Bealey preached an excellent sermon, rendered highly interesting by an unreserved avowal of a change of sentiments, respecting the Unitarian system. The next morning, the Committee of the Unitarian Book and Tract Society, in the counties of Lancaster and Chester, had their annual meeting. By this Committee the publication of the two sermons preached the day before, was unanimously requested. Mr. Bealey, in consequence, will publish the sermon in question, as well as another, preached at Manchester the following Sunday, both of which are eminently entitled to the dispassionate attention of candid Christians of all denominations. Mr. Johns intends to reduce the materials of which his sermon chiefly consists, into the form of a tract. The next Quarterly Meeting will be held at Cokey-moor, on Good-friday. W. J.

---

* I have not mentioned places in the order in which I visited them, but according to their relative situations: several places I visited more than once. For want of previous knowledge of their relative situations, I had much travelling which might otherwise have been avoided.

Chinese Edict against Christianity.

Canton, *April* 4, 1812.

The following Edict was translated from the Chinese into Spanish, by a Romish Missionary at Macao; and translated out of Spanish into English. I have not seen the original Chinese paper. I have seen several papers in the Pekin Gazette, of which the following is indeed the substance. In those papers, however, the magistrates also are threatened with degradation, dismissal from the service of government, &c. if they connive at the promulgation of what they denominate TEENCHU KEAOU (*the religion of the Lord of Heaven*), the name which the Romish Missionaries have adopted. R. M.

The Criminal Tribunal, by order of the Emperor, conformably to a Representation made by HAN, the Imperial Secretary (in which he desired that the Promulgation of the Christian Religion might be obviated) decrees as follows:—

The Europeans worship God, because, in their own country they are used to do so; and it is quite unnecessary to inquire into the motive: but then, why do they disturb the common people of the interior? Appointing unauthorisedly priests and other functionaries, who spread this through all the provinces, in obvious infraction of the law; and the common people, deceived by them, they succeed each other from generation to generation, unwilling to depart from their delusion. This may approach very near to being a rebellion. Reflecting that the said religion neither holds spirits in veneration nor ancestors in reverence,—clearly this is to walk contrary to sound doctrine; and the common people, who follow and familiarize themselves with such delusions, in what respect do they differ from a rebel mob? If there is not decreed some punishment, how shall the evil be eradicated?—and how shall the human heart be rectified?

From this time forward, such Europeans as shall privately print books and establish preachers, in order to pervert the multitude,—and the Tartars and Chinese, who, deputed by Europeans, shall propagate their religion, bestowing names, and disquieting numbers, shall have this to look to:—The chief or principal one shall be executed;—whoever shall spread their religion, not making much disturbance, nor to many men, and without giving names, shall be imprisoned, waiting the time of execution:—and those who shall content themselves with following such religion, without wishing to reform themselves, they shall be exiled to He-lau-keang, &c. As for Tartars, they shall be deprived of their pay. With respect to Europeans, at present in Pekin, if they are Mathematicians, without having other office or occupation, this suffices to their being kept in their employments; but those who do not understand mathematics, what motive is there for acquiescing in their idleness, whilst they are exciting irregularities? Let the Mandarins, in charge of the Europeans, inquire and act. Excepting the mathematicians, who are to be retained in their employment, the other Europeans shall be sent to the Viceroy of Canton, to wait there, that when there come ships from the respective countries, they may be sent back. The Europeans in actual service at the capital, are forbidden to intermeddle with the Tartars and Chinese, in order to strike at the root of the absurdities which have been propagated. In Pekin, where there are no more Europeans than those employed in the mathematics, they will not be able clandestinely to spread false religion. The Viceroys and other magistrates of the other provinces, shall be careful and diligent. If they find Europeans within their territories, they shall seize them, and act according to justice, in order, by such means to exterminate root and trunk.—You shall conform to this decision of the Criminal Tribunal.

[*Evangelical Magazine for January* 1813.]

Fast Day.

It will scarcely be intelligence to the majority of our readers that a GENERAL FAST is appointed for England on Feb. 24, and for Scotland, Feb. 25: may we indulge the hope of those Dissenters that *observe the day*, that *to the Lord they will observe it*, devoting it to the sacred interests of Peace and Charity.

Dissenting Ministers.

The body of Dissenting Ministers, of the Three Denominations in and about London, are summoned to meet at the Library, in Red Cross Street, on Tuesday next, February 2nd, to consider of a petition to Parliament for Universal Religious Liberty. We anticipate a pleasing report of their proceedings in our next number.

PEACE.

[Under this head, we mean to insert accounts of the proceedings of our countrymen, to put a stop to the crimes, miseries and horrors of War.——Communications on this subject are requested from our Readers. ED.]

Proceedings of the Meeting to Petition for Peace, held at the Bowling-Green, St. Peter's Lane, Leicester, on Wednesday, the 18*th of November*, 1812.

Precisely at eleven o'clock, on the motion of Mr. Robert Brewin, seconded by the Rev. C. Berry, Mr. John Coltman took the chair.

Mr. *John Ryley* spoke to the following effect :—

" Sir, I am deputed by the Committee to state the measures which have been adopted, and which have finally led to the present meeting. I am also to propose various resolutions, all of which, though I have had no share in their selection or composition, I do most cordially approve. Sir, I am entirely unaccustomed to speaking in public, but were I sure to falter at every word, I would still say all I could, and leave the rest to the candour of my countrymen. A cause like ours needs no specious oratory to set it forth, it touches us all too closely, and it is probable that there is not one among us who is not by the war, against which we are assembled to protest, galled most keenly. Various meetings had been held, at most of which you, Sir, most ably presided, before it was resolved to hand a requisition to the mayor, signed by *thirty-one* respectable names, desiring him to convene a meeting of the inhabitants of this town, for the very important object which will form the business of this day. To this requisition an answer was returned, altogether declining to call the meeting, and assigning as a principal reason for this negative, the riotous disposition of some of the inhabitants of this town, manifested during the late election, and recommending that we should conduct the business of petitioning in a snug and private way. Really, Sir, this is the most brilliant specimen of a *non sequitur* I ever recollect to have heard of:—because there happens to be a disposition to riot at a contested election, we are therefore to be debarred from the legal exercise of our constitutional right of petitioning the legislature; it is like the Irishman's echo, which when any one asked 'How do you do?' answered 'Pretty well, I thank you.' But, after all, what was this formidable riot? Sir, I am not disposed to jest with riots, they are at all times serious things, and should be treated seriously; but if this was so fearful a commotion, why was it treated so lightly? In its earlier stages, at least it consisted principally of girls and boys, and half a dozen stout constables would have routed their main battallion in an instant, and compelled the drum and fife either to surrender at discretion, or to evacuate the field. I may now be permitted, Sir, to advert briefly to some objections which have been urged against our proceedings :—The first was pressed upon me by a man of strong head and English heart; he expressed his anxiety for peace, but his conviction that the system of petitioning was wrong, as tending to encourage the enemy, and to weaken the hands of government. As a general position the argument is a good one, but its force entirely depends upon the presumption that the government is pacifically inclined. This disposition on the part of the present ministers has, I am aware, been very recently and very strenuously asserted by men of high respectability; but unfortunately the reverse is capable of direct proof. Why, in answer to the late overture on the part of the French emperor, did Lord Castlereagh shut himself up in the feeble rigidity of diplomatic forms, and refuse him his legitimate title? a title, his claim to which, it is for Frenchmen, not for us to question. The overture itself might be insidious, but the reply was most insulting and indicative of every thing but a wish for peace. But another, and a very different description of opponents, loudly and in a public room, made much shorter work of the whole matter, by calling us Jacobins, and affirming that

‘ none but Jacobins would make peace with such a fellow as Buonaparte.” Sir, so long as I am conscious of a loyal attachment to my king, and to the constitutional government of my country, I care very little what I am called, by men who are themselves the true Jacobins, and who labour to keep alive a party spirit, which the conductors of the present transaction have sought wholly to dismiss. But why are we not to make peace with Buonaparte?—because he is a tyrant.—Granted, he *is* a tyrant—but what is that to us? Have we never shaken hands with tyrants? What then was Catherine of Russia, who in her palace of Tsarsko-selo always dined with two pictures full in her view representing the butchery of Ismail, and the murderous storm of Atchakof? Did we not court the friendship of her grandson Paul? and are we not, at this moment, the allies of the most holy Inquisition of Madrid? But it avails nothing to reason with men like these, and I will not waste another argument upon their pitiful abuse. I say to them—Go on, your censure is our best reward!—I propose the 1st resolution for the consideration of the meeting.”

The 2d resolution was seconded by the Rev. Mr. *Mitchell,* in the following terms:—

“Sir, and Gentlemen—Permit me to express my approbation of the object of this meeting, and of the resolution which has just been moved; and to observe, that it gives me unspeakable satisfaction to see so numerous and respectable an assembly convened in this town, for the purpose of petitioning the legislature for the speedy restoration of peace.

“In its mildest form war is an evil ever to be deplored. The principles from which it originates, and the maxims by which it is usually conducted, are as repugnant to the dictates of humanity as to the mild spirit of the Christian religion; and whatever temporary advantages it may in some instances afford, it is ever found to be ultimately as inimical to the welfare of states as to the happiness of individuals.

“The contest in which we are at present engaged, gentlemen, is awfully distinguished, not only by the mighty energies which it has called into action, but also by the unparalleled miseries which it has occasioned. Excepting only a short interval of repose, it has continued to rage now nearly twenty years, during which melancholy period millions of the human species have been cut off—the whole European continent agitated and convulsed—and misery extended into almost every quarter of the globe. Were it possible, gentlemen, to give any thing like a perfect representation of the multiplied horrors and calamities with which the present war has afflicted the nations of the earth, I question whether any of us would have fortitude enough only to contemplate the hideous spectacle!

“We reflect with pleasure and gratitude, that in no stage of this long-protracted and disastrous struggle, has this country been the seat of war.—Encircled by watery bulwarks—guarded by an invisible Providence, our shores have been preserved in peace, and the sword has never been drawn for the purposes of shedding human blood among ourselves: but, having taken a decided and a principal part in supporting and prolonging the contest, we deeply participate, as might have been expected, in its ruinous consequences. Gentlemen, I will not torture your feelings by recalling to your recollection the sufferings of thousands of our brave countrymen abroad, who have either fallen in the field of battle, or are at this moment enduring all the rigours of war;—nor will I enlarge on the affecting scenes of domestic woe, which the war has occasioned at home—how many peaceful dwellings it has converted into houses of mourning!—how many parents, widows, and orphans, it has bereaved of those who were dearer to them than their own lives!—But, I ask, to what cause are we to ascribe those almost insupportable privations and burdens which now *oppress every class in the community*—ESPECIALLY THE POOR AND MIDDLE CLASSES?—Contrasting the internal condition of this country at present with what some of us recollect it to have been twenty years ago, do we not perceive a most melancholy alteration? What has produced this alteration?—It is not necessary to inform you, gentlemen, that our national debt is now augmented to the enormous sum of 800 millions—that our taxes are multiplied till financial ingenuity can scarcely invent a new impost—that our commerce, on which our individual support as well as our national superiority depends, has long been crippled, and is now almost annihilated: you know these things only too well. Nor need I remind you, gentlemen, of the present exorbitant price—I do not say of luxuries—*but of necessaries*—OF BREAD! of which the numerous families which have been reduced, in spite of all that prudence or industry could do to prevent, from easy, if not affluent circumstances, to beggary! Of the long, long lists of bankrupts which appear in every week's Gazette; of the thousands of artizans and manufacturers who are *willing to work*, *desirous of working*, but who, through the failure in trade, are either without employment altogether, or can only obtain half work, and that at reduced wages; and of the thousands more who are compelled to accept, and even solicit, the boon of charity; while an equal number, reluctant to submit to this humiliation, are literally pining and perishing from want! I say, Gentlemen, it is not necessary to remind you of these facts because it is impossible that you should forget them—they exist among ourselves—you see them every week, every day, and some, if not all, do more than *see* them—YOU FEEL THEM. But, Gentlemen, I ask, what is the cause of these calamities? And I ask, not because it is difficult to trace them to their true origin: that we all know. It is the war—the portentous war in which we have unhappily been so long engaged, that has brought upon us this long catalogue of ills, and thousands more not mentioned: nor can any thing afford us effectual and permanent relief but *peace*—SPEEDY PEACE!

"That the restoration of peace will completely, and at once, remove all the calamities under which we groan, I do not assert: but there can be no doubt, I think, that it will completely remove the principal of them and considerably diminish the rest Let peace be restored, and I anticipate as the immediate consequence, *the revival of commerce*, THE REDUCTION OF PROVISIONS, AND PLENTY OF EMPLOYMENT FOR THE INDUSTRIOUS POOR: and possessing these primary and cardinal blessings, the remaining ill effects of war will be cheerfully borne. With the potent energies which this nation still possesses, her remaining wealth, her natural and political advantages, the intelligence, industry, enterprise, and public spirit of her sons, I can have no doubt but that, on the return of peace, she will instantly rise from her present depression, and soon attain her former elevation. But if, on the contrary, peace is denied us, and the present system of warfare be continued, what have we to look for, Gentlemen—the *continuance* of our present burdens, the *augmentation* of these burdens! I am unwilling, Gentlemen, to excite *unnecessary* fears in the mind of any one; but I cannot forbear saying, that if the present war-system be continued much longer, I forebode a catastrophe too painful to be expressed! Are we not *imperiously called upon* to put a stop to the horrors of war as soon as possible? And is not neutrality or supineness a disposition which, in a case of such immense magnitude and importance, we cannot justify, and dare not indulge?

"It seemed proper, Gentlemen, to notice some of the natural effects of war, because they furnish a strong reason in favour of peace; but let it not be imagined that these are the only, or the worst, effects of war. Extended and protracted warfare is productive of another class of evils, perfectly different in their nature, and which, though not so much thought of, perhaps, as the former, are still more to be deprecated, since they are more directly opposed to our national safety and happiness—I refer to the *moral*, or rather *immoral*, tendency of war. Not only all those who put on the military habit, and consider war as their profession, (and the number of these at present is not small) but thousands besides who have nothing directly to do with the war, are in a moral respect materially affected by it. It is obvious then, Gentlemen, that a system of war, conducted on an extended scale, and protracted through a long succession of years, must very materially affect the moral character of the nation; and it requires no argument or reasoning at all to prove that its tendency in this view must be extremely pernicious, originating, as it does, from the worst passions in human nature—ambition, avarice, and love of power: its only tendency on society must be to diminish the sum of public virtue, and increase and propagate vice. In many and various ways the immoral tendency of the war is but too apparent; it exalts expediency into the place of equity, and leads men to prefer that which is convenient or advantageous, to that which is just. Patriotism, or a regard to the interests of our own county, which is virtuous only when properly restrained and limited, is cherished, not merely to the neglect of universal benevolence, or a proper regard for our species at large, but in opposition to it. Among ourselves, its tendency to generate and foster a narrow, selfish spirit, to divide the inhabitants of the same district or town into parties, to engender political antipathies, than which no feeling takes deeper root, and is with greater difficulty eradicated, is notorious. What is, if possible, still more to be deplored, is its tendency to harden the heart. By filling our newspapers, and other periodical works, which are accessible to all, and read with the greatest avidity by all, with minute details of the most horrid battles, it renders carnage and bloodshed familiar to our minds; and, from the force of habit, whatever becomes familiar will, at least, if great care be not taken to prevent, cease to produce its proper impression on our hearts Reading, hearing, and conversing frequently about slaughtered thousands and tens of thousands, tends insensibly to diminish that horror which we ought ever to entertain at the shedding of human blood, to lower our estimate of the value of human life, to blunt the finest sympathies of our nature, and give to the heart a character of obduracy and ferocity. This, Gentlemen, is the natural tendency of war. How far it has actually produced this baneful effect on the minds of our countrymen, is difficult to ascertain; but it is the opinion of some, that the numerous instances of shocking murder of which we hear, and the recent atrocious assassination which, for a season at least, diffused alarm through the country, are melancholy proofs that the war has, in this respect, gradually effected an unhappy change in the minds of our countrymen. But, Gentlemen, whether this be a just inference or not, the tendency of war to promote licentiousness and dissipation is too apparent in its effects to have escaped your observation. Large military establishments, the necessary consequence of the war system, operate in the neighbourhoods where they are planted like a moral pestilence—the very atmosphere of such establishments is contagious; few can breathe it with perfect safety; but it is most fatal to our youth; unsuspecting, unexperienced, unestablished, how many young persons, of both sexes, are, by this means, seduced, corrupted, ruined; lost to virtue, to shame, to their friends, to society; who, but for the contagious example thus presented, might have been sober, virtuous, useful, happy; the stay of their parents, the honour of their connections, the pillars and ornament of society. Gentlemen, the pestilential influence of the war-system is as certain, to virtuous minds at least, as it must be painful But to see the full force of this argument upon the question at issue, you must consider its bearing on our safety and happiness as a nation. The security and happiness of nations, Gentlemen, depends, under Providence, on nothing so much as on the virtue of the people. The wisest prince of antiquity, perhaps the wisest that ever wore a diadem, has said that 'righteousness exalteth a nation, while sin is a reproach to any people.' The observation is founded on the nature of things: for righteousness or virtue is the health of the political body, while vice is its disease; and the truth of it is confirmed by the history of all nations. Admitting, as we all do admit, that there is a Divine Providence, which superintends the affairs of nations, takes cognizance of their moral actions, and punishes or rewards them in the present life, we cannot for a moment doubt, that while abounding iniquity tends to misery and ruin, virtue, especially Christian virtue, is their firmest, surest bulwark. And since it is manifest that protracted war tends, in many ways, to corrupt and vitiate the public mind, are we not required to do all in our power to hasten its termination? To say nothing of religion, though we are now verging on sacred ground, and I might without impropriety press the argument on this ground; yet to say nothing on this head, I appeal to that regard for the interests of our country, which, I am persuaded, animates every heart. And I ask, since vice leads to national ruin, and war promotes vice, can we give a better proof of our love to our country, than by petitioning our rulers to embrace the earliest opportunity to terminate the war?

"With the strongest motives that can be imagined to petition for peace, I know of no mighty objection that can be alledged against such a measure. Nor can I hastily admit, that to petition the legislature for the restoration of peace will be of no avail.

Our rulers are either disposed to adopt pacific measures or not. Supposing that they *are*, is not this rather an argument in favour of petitioning than against it? For will it not be gratifying, rather than displeasing to them, to find that the sentiments and disposition of the people coincide with their own? But in the supposition they are inclined to protract the war, and the objection rests on this supposition, will the wishes of the people, expressed with becoming deference and firmness, produce no impression? Gentlemen, until the event has proved that our legislators can and will treat the opinions and wishes of the people with total disregard, I will not admit the idea.

"Much, I am aware, will depend on *unanimity* in this business. A single petition—a few petitions will avail nothing. But let all the friends of peace, who I am confident are a very great majority in the kingdom, come forward, and with one heart and voice, address the legislature as they are *entitled* to do, and as they *ought* to do; and it requires not the spirit of prophecy to foretel the result. The only thing to be dreaded, Gentlemen, is the want of this promptness and unanimity. But even this ground of fear is beginning to subside; our countrymen are beginning to shake off the spirit of slumber and awake to a just sense of their duty, their interest. Our example this day may have some influence. But should they remain supine, and our efforts, through their supineness, fail of accomplishing the desired effect, still we shall have the satisfaction to reflect, that we have done what we could to check the horrors of war, and restore peace to a distracted, bleeding world!

"Gentlemen, before I sit down permit me to offer one thought more which just occurs. War cannot be eternal. It contains within itself its own antidote. After having swept the earth with the besom of destruction, it will destroy itself The olive of peace shall be planted and shall flourish in every clime. The din of war, the clangor of arms, the shouts of the victorious, the groans of the dying, shall for ever cease, and every object that meets the eye, every sound that accosts the ear, shall indicate the most perfect security, peace and happiness. Our eyes may not see this golden era, this millenial year, this desire of all nations, but come it will: and as it will be introduced by human agency, in part at least, who can tell but our efforts this day, inconsiderable as they are, may contribute, in some degree, to accelerate its arrival."

The Rev. *C. Berry* seconded the 4th resolution, and proceeded as follows:—

"Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen, I rise to have the pleasure of seconding the resolution which you have just heard, and of publicly declaring my entire approbation of the object and proceedings of this Meeting. There are few occasions which could have induced me to address such a numerous and respectable assembly, as that to which I have now the honor of speaking; but this is one of those occasions, upon which a sense of duty is irresistible. It appears to me that we are acting, this day, as men and as Christians ought to act; as becomes the lovers of their country and of mankind; more especially (as this resolution signifies) in harmony with that religion which we all profess; and, I will add, with respect to myself, consistently with the spirit and duties of that profession of which I am a member, which is peculiarly called upon to promote, in every way, the peace and happiness of mankind.

"Gentlemen, the evils and calamities of war are an inexhaustible subject: we all know the privations and afflictions which it produces: I shall not dwell upon them; they are painful and distressing to contemplate; they have been already strikingly illustrated by my professional colleague, who has just addressed you. Besides which, I hope we are animated with higher and more generous motives, than to wish and petition for peace, merely that we may have an opportunity of becoming a richer and more luxurious nation! It is not merely that our trade may be relieved from its present burdens, and that *our* condition alone may be more easy and prosperous:—our views are more benevolent and extensive—we look to promote the comfort and contentment of the poorer classes of society—we desire to promote the spread of religion and virtue among mankind, which are opposed by nothing more than the spirit, and the evils of war—we wish, by a faithful delineation of these burdens and calamities, to induce our rulers to listen to our petition, that the mouths of the poor may be filled with bread, and that their hearts may sing for joy.

"Gentlemen, there is another point of view in which the effects of war are not often considered, either by princes or people; I mean its moral, or rather its *immoral* consequences—its tendency to vitiate the feelings and character of a nation. Habits of war harden the heart, and blunt the finest and purest feelings of humanity; make us cold and cruel calculators, where the misery of millions of our fellow creatures is involved. Besides which, the pressure of those burdens which war creates, unavoidably tends to subvert the honour, and even the honesty, of the nation: it taxes, if I may so speak, the national integrity. In order to satisfy the imperative demands of the government, we are obliged to press hard upon each other; and, I am afraid I might add, in too many instances persons are induced to defraud and overreach their neighbours: the landlord presses upon the tenant and the farmer; they again upon the buyer and consumer; and thus upon all classes and individuals in society: and the free and independent spirit of genuine commerce, which enriched our forefathers, and has so much exalted this nation, is exchanged for *the arts of fraud, and often the baseness of falsehood and perjury!* I need not add THAT THIS LOSS OF CHARACTER, IS THE GREATEST LOSS THAT A NATION CAN SUSTAIN.

"Gentlemen, I cannot omit here to remind you again of the truth of the resolution which I have risen to support, 'that it is the especial duty of a nation, professing Christianity, to employ every effort in its power to prevent the multiplied horrors and calamities of war." We certainly have not made these efforts so sincerely, so earnestly as we ought to have done. We have been distinguished by a *love* of war—we have excited and supported much of the warfare with which Europe has been desolated these last twenty years. While we have been favoured, in an eminent degree, with the advantages of religious truth, this does not seem to have produced in us that moderate and peaceful spirit, which is the peculiar ornament and the solemn injunction of the religion we profess: I say, therefore, that it peculiarly becomes *us* to use every effort to put a period to these calamities; and, in all probability, *I should speak the truth, if I said, that the cause of Christianity has been more injured by the crimes and the wars of European nations, than it has been benefited by any of their benevolent labours and institutions*;--THE VOICE OF TRUTH AND THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY ARE NOT LISTENED TO AND NOT CONSIDERED, AMID THE DIN AND RAVAGES OF WAR.

"Gentlemen, before I conclude I shall take the liberty briefly to notice, and to reply to, some objections which I have heard alleged against the present meeting, in conversation or otherwise. In the first place, it has been said, that our petition will be useless, because the ministry are sincerely desirous of peace, and will omit no opportunity of obtaining it. I most sincerely hope this is the case; but I must be allowed to say, that I think differently —from their political connections and habits, I imagine they are *not* so earnestly desirous of peace as they *ought* to be, and as the state of the country requires that they *should* be. They entered upon their offices by the direct and formal exclusion of those political characters who are known, through the country, to be most friendly to liberal and pacific measures; they were some of them in the late administration, and, I suppose I may say, they were *all* of them its friends and supporters: and the former ministry undoubtedly conducted the affairs of the nation with the same views of policy, and upon the same general principles which have influenced our national operations these last twenty years; and whether these have been principles of peace or not, let the European history of this period determine. But, Gentlemen, even supposing us to be mistaken, which I hope is the case, this does not render our present conduct inexpedient. No ministers of the crown in this country, can conduct the affairs of government, unless they are supported by a powerful body of friends, both *in* parliament and *out* of it. There are multitudes of persons in this kingdom who are friendly to war—who support it by their wealth and influence: there are not a few to whom it is a source of honour and emolument. I say, these, if the ministry are happily converted to be the friends of peace, there is reason to fear, that many of these to whom I have referred are *not* so. Now let us *support* the ministry in their pacific intentions,—let us sustain them against the influence of the war-party,—let us put it into their power to say, when they become the advocates of peace, that they speak the sentiments of a large proportion of the people. I most heartily wish that our petition may be rendered nugatory and useless by no other circumstance than that which the objection supposes. Gentlemen, I must apologize *for these* political *remarks: they are inseparable from the subject. I could not give a satisfactory reply to the objection without them: and I wish to stand justified before my friends and fellow townsmen upon this occasion.*

"Gentlemen, I have heard it said, that such meetings as these tend to promote popular violence and disorder. You will give me credit when I say, that if I had supposed that such in any degree would be the result of this day, I should not now have had the pleasure of addressing you: I think quite otherwise; our proceedings upon this subject have been most temperate and peaceful, and I hope and believe, will be useful. We are doing what the constitution of our country encourages us to do. Our resolutions are not violent and imflammatory. Quite the contrary. Those who are offended with these expressions would be so, I fear, with any language in which unpleasing truth might be spoken to them. In these cases the evil is not in the thing itself, but in the manner in which it is accomplished, which, in this instance, I apprehend, is unobjectionable. Gentlemen, I cannot forbear saying, that the allusion to popular tumult in the Mayor's letter to us upon this subject, was not pertinent or well founded. To compare the proceedings at an election, which continues three or four days, and which is proverbially attended with some agitation and disorder, to compare such proceedings, with our present meeting, held in the face of day, and for a definite and specific object, was not fair, or handsome—was not worthy of that wisdom and liberality which ought, at all times, to distinguish the first magistrate of this borough.

"Gentlemen, I have heard it further alleged, that the parliament which we are about to petition, is a *new* parliament, and that on this account our endeavours are inappropriate and unbecoming. It is said that we should wait to see *what* measures will be proposed, and what course will be taken. Now I humbly suppose you will agree with me, Mr. Chairman, in thinking that there is no force in this objection; it rather strengthens the arguments in our favour. A parliament that has sat for some years, may be supposed to be *pledged* to the support of a particular system, they may be, if I may so speak, entangled by their own measures. There is an appearance of consistency and steadiness, which must be preserved—there is a feeling of shame, which may, perhaps, operate in preventing any alteration in their political decisions—I do not refer to any particular persons or parliament—I speak of the universal and unchangeable principles of human nature. Now these remarks do not apply to a *new* parliament: they are, in some respects, more free to deliberate and choose; they have a renovated political being; they are to *enter afresh* upon the consideration of the affairs of the empire; they are to lay aside all former feuds, animosities, and prejudices. Their peculiar situation permits them more freely, and, I might almost say, *encourages* them to distinguish themselves by *new measures.* Under these circumstances, then, there is a peculiar propriety in our petition. They should be provided with every means of ascertaining the real state and wishes of the country, before they have committed themselves, so as to render it difficult to recede. As far as our petition extends, it serves to furnish them with this information. We tell them that we look to them *for new* measures. We hope that they will inherit the blessings of their country and of posterity, by a more liberal and enlightened policy, than former parliaments have approved. We do not prescribe to their wisdom, the especial time and terms of peace; but we *do* declare to them, that their petitioners *look to Peace*, as the only effectual termination of those privations and calamities which afflict our native country.

"Gentlemen, I have but one more objection to reply to; it is, that our proceedings upon this subject will promote a party spirit, and tend to produce disunion and unhappiness among us. I hope not so: I should sincerely lament it. A *pacific* spirit is not a *party* spirit. We pass no censure on those who think differently from ourselves;—there may be a difference of sentiment without hostility of feeling. We may all love our country, and seek to promote its happiness and prosperity, though in different ways; the spirit of party is not in those who *declare* their opinions, but in those who are offended and irritated by that declaration. I have the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with, and respect for, many persons in this town, whose opinions are diametrically opposite to mine, on many important points of religion and policy; but my feelings of friendship and respect for them, are not the weaker on this account: and I thus publicly declare, that if any bitterness of party spirit be the consequence of what we are now doing, it will be in *them* towards *me* and not in *me* towards *them*.

"Mr. Chairman, I have thought it right to mention these objections, which I had heard, and I have endeavoured to reply to them. If we are yet a free nation, *we ought to think freely* and TO SPEAK FREELY. And, Gentlemen, it is my entire persuasion, that if *we*, if our *country* be restrained by these, or any other considerations, from declaring their sentiments and wishes to the legislature; and if these opinions and wishes are not seriously considered, then are we, indeed, a LOST NATION,—and the rulers of our country and of the world will only be awakened, and roused from their infatuation, by some general and awful explosion of the popular feeling—by some extensive calamity, in which all parties and distinctions will be involved in one common ruin!!! To use a plain, but appropriate simile—if the waters be permitted to flow in their natural and appointed channel, they will adorn and fertilize the fields; but if they be obstructed and stopped, they will accumulate, break down their borders, and ravage and desolate the land.

"Gentlemen, I thank you for the patience with which you have listened to me. I have only to add, that if *our* present endeavours should excite the *same* throughout the country; and if these should contribute to the *attainment* of the object we seek, we may number *this* among the happiest and proudest days of our lives: but if we should fail, we cannot be deprived of the pleasure of having done our duty. If we cannot give peace to our *country*, we shall give it to our *consciences*: we shall have delivered ourselves from all criminal participation in the future crimes and distresses of our country; and this is the purest satisfaction we are capable of receiving on this side the grave."

Mr. *Ryley* introduced the petition with a few observations to the following purport:—"That war, famine, and pestilence, were the three severest scourges of an offended God; but that war was the direst of the three, for it led the others in its train. It gives to the minds of men a savage and sanguinary cast; it has actually done this, it has marred the moral beauty of the British character and degraded the brave and high-minded Englishman into a dark and dastardly assassin. With respect to America, it may be that the intentional injuries of France and England have been the same; but the actual injuries of England have been unquestionably the greater, and though I will not vindicate the conduct of the United States in waging war against us exclusively, yet I will contend, that we have forfeited even the privilege of complaint. Mr. Canning, in his election speeches, has been pleased to triumph in the failure of our conciliatory overtures, and to ask what we had gained by concession? Why, we have gained much; we have acquired a larger party in America, and, even if we have derived no positive benefit from concession, we have at least gained this—that we are something less in the wrong than we were before."

Resolutions and Petition.

Resolved 1st. That it is the opinion of this Meeting that PEACE is a blessing most earnestly to be desired for our native country and for the world at large.

2. That the continuance of the war in which we are at present engaged, threatens us with an alarming increase of those burdens and calamities which it has already produced, and seems in no way likely to conduce to the solid glory or true interests of our country.

3. That the extraordinary success which has recently attended the British arms, renders the present a time peculiarly favourable for endeavouring to negociate a peace, because such offers of peace could not be attributed to pusillanimity or despair.

4. That it is the especial duty of a

nation professing Christianity, to employ every effort in its power to prevent the multiplied horrors and calamities of war.

5. That under these circumstances, a Petition be presented to the honourable the House of Commons, praying that no opportunity may be omitted that appears favourable for obtaining an equitable and permanent Peace.

6. That the following form of Petition be adopted:—

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled: the humble Petition of the undersigned Friends to Christianity and Humanity, in the Town and Neighbourhood of Leicester.

SHEWETH,—That your petitioners beg leave, in the constitutional exercise of their right as Englishmen, with feelings of deep anxiety, to represent to your honourable House, the pain with which they have contemplated the numerous and complicated horrors occasioned by the present long protracted war; the severe privations and intolerable burthens, which its continuance has imposed on the lower and middling classes of society; and the general despondency which prevails, from the apprehension that no effort is made for the restoration of peace.

That your petitioners, therefore, humbly request permission to call the attention of your honourable house to a consideration of the miseries which this continued and wide-spread war has inflicted on mankind; a consideration which cannot but afflict every heart not dead to humanity and Christian charity.

That your petitioners reflect with horror, on the fact, that of the last twenty years, nineteen have been spent in actual warfare: (a circumstance, as your petitioners believe, unparalleled in the history of Britain, since the revival of civilization in Europe); that during this melancholy period, the lives actually sacrificed by war, may, without exaggeration, be computed to have exceeded the number of all the male adults now in Great Britain; and that, in the same space of time, almost every known part of the world has been visited by its dreadful calamities.

That your petitioners cannot reflect, without agony, on the miseries endured by the thousands of our valiant countrymen, dying on the fields of battle, immured for lingering years in the prisons of the enemy, languishing in hospitals, or slowly wasting by disease in pestilential climates, or unwholesome camps.

That, at home, the feelings of your petitioners are constantly agitated by the miseries ever attendant on a state of warfare; the desolated houses, the mourning widows, and the fatherless children of their slaughtered countrymen; miseries, the continued increase of which can be prevented only by peace.

That your petitioners still further deplore the dreadful tendency of war, to blunt the feelings of humanity, and to deprave the habits and institutions of social life; they regard it as a subject of deep concern, that our youth, at an age, and in proportions unknown to former times, are ballotted for military services; that our youth, of both sexes, in numbers which humanity mourns to behold, are exposed to the pernicious influence of that dissipation and debauchery, which large military establishments never fail to produce.

That, in addition to these appalling effects of war, your petitioners have to lament the decay of trade. They observe, with fearful apprehension, the ruin of our once opulent merchants, the languishing state of our once flourishing manufactures, and the condition of our artizans, now degraded to poverty and dependance. Your petitioners are further compelled to state, that these evils, combined with the burden of taxes, occasioned by the war, and the price of provisions exorbitantly augmented by the same cause, have filled the Gazettes with bankrupts, and the gaols with debtors; and that the large and numerous workhouses are become insufficient to contain the thousands of paupers, who weekly seek an asylum there.

That your petitioners view, with the strongest feelings of distress, an extension of the war to our brethren and former fellow subjects of America, whose friendship has at all times been of the highest importance to the empire at large, but more particularly so to the suffering and industrious artizans of this populous town and district.

That, above all, your petitioners feel the indelible reproach which a system of perpetual warfare casts on nations professing our pure and holy faith, and its utter inconsistency with the whole spirit of the gospel.

That as those to whom life and immortality are revealed, your petitioners are taught to connect this world with that which is to come, and hence are filled with serious apprehensions that, while the licentious influence of war on public and on private morals has rendered multitudes less fit to meet the eternal judge, the sword has hurried them to his awful tribunal.

Your petitioners, therefore, earnestly invoke your honourable house to regard the multiplied scenes of public distress and silent suffering, which are ever occasioned by war, and which, at the present hour, the voice of misery, arising from the habitations of millions, more forcibly describes than any representation which your petitioners can give. They therefore respectfully intreat you to employ every means which the wisdom of your honourable house can devise, and which Christianity and humanity alike imperiously demand, for the speedy restoration of Peace. And that your petitioners beg leave to assure your house, that the peace which they contemplate is not such as shall surrender any of the just rights of Britain. Her liberties and independence are the objects nearest to the hearts of your petitioners; and it is in the spirit of a pure, disinterested, and generous patriotism alone, that they prefer to your honourable house their fervent prayer for the restoration of those blessings, which only peace can confer, and which your petitioners can never cease to urge on the consideration of your honourable house, by every mode which the constitution of their country has made the birthright of free-born Britons.

7. That the Petition lie for signatures at Mr. Shenton's counting-house, opposite the Exchange.

8. That Samuel Smith, Esquire, and Thomas Babington, Esquire, the representatives of this borough, be requested to present this Petition, and that *they*, and the members for the county, be solicited to give their support and influence to the same.

9. That the conveyance of the public opinion to the legislature, in a respectful and temperate manner, is constitutional and highly expedient, and, so far from endangering the public tranquillity, obviously and unquestionably tends to *prevent* the evils of sedition and disorder.

10. That the thanks of this Meeting are due to the thirty-one gentlemen who signed the unsuccessful requisition to the Mayor, and to those gentlemen who have called the present Meeting.

11. That the proceedings of this Meeting be advertised in the *two* Leicester papers, the Morning Chronicle and Courier London papers, the Nottingham, Stamford, Northampton and Birmingham papers.

12. That a committee be formed to carry the resolutions of this Meeting into immediate execution, consisting of the thirty-one gentlemen who signed the requisition to the Mayor, any five of whom shall be competent to act.

13. That a subscription be opened to defray the expences of this Petition, which subscription will be received by Mr. Joseph Nunneley, at the High Cross; where also a copy of the Petition will lie for signatures.

14. That the thanks of this Meeting be presented to the Rev. Thomas Mitchell, the Rev. Charles Berry, and to John Ryley, Esq. for their appropriate and animated speeches upon the occasion.

15. That the thanks of this Meeting be presented to Walter Ruding, Esq. and to J. E. Carter, Esq. for their handsome letters and the support they have given to this Meeting.

(Signed) JOHN COLTMAN,
Chairman.

Mr. Nunnely having taken the chair, the thanks of this Meeting were unanimously voted to Mr. John Coltman, for his impartial and upright conduct in the chair.

(Signed) JOSEPH NUNNELY.

Petition from Warwick.

To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, the humble Petition of the Burgesses and Inhabitants of the Borough of Warwick:—

Sheweth,—That your petitioners beg leave to represent to your honourable House the pain with which they have contemplated the numerous and complicated evils arising from the present wide-spread and long-protracted war, and the growing despondency which pervades all classes of the community, from the remembrance, that no effort has been made hitherto for the restoration of Peace, and from the apprehension that none is likely to be made, without the direct and salutary influence of public opinion upon public measures.

That your petitioners, at a juncture which appears to them highly favourable to their wishes, address your honourable house with the greater confidence, because they conceive that the members of a new parliament, by looking abroad upon the peculiar character of these eventful times, and by adapting their counsels to the real and imperious exigencies of the common weal, may obtain for themselves the gratitude of a free and enlightened people, and may stand distinguished to the latest posterity, as the restorers of tranquillity and security to the whole civilized world.

That your petitioners cannot, without feelings of unfeigned anxiety, observe the rapidity with which the calamities of war have recently extended themselves from the impoverished and depopulated nations of Europe to the distant shores of South America, where civil discord subjects thousands and tens of thousands to the destroying sword, and of North America, where a race of men, united to us by the ties of a common descent, a common language and a common religion, are now opposed to us, under circumstances the most distressing and most alarming to them and to ourselves.

That your petitioners believe it to be a fact quite unparalleled in the history of civilized nations throughout Europe, that of the last twenty years, eighteen have been spent in actual warfare, and that the lives already sacrificed in the course of it, may, without exaggeration, be said to exceed the number of male adults now existing in Great Britain.

That, reflecting upon what has passed and is passing, in foreign lands, your petitioners have to mourn for the miseries endured by multitudes of valiant men, perishing on the field of battle, lingering months and years in the gloomy prisons of the enemy, languishing in hospitals, or slowly wasting by disease in crowded camps and pestilential climates.

That your petitioners, looking around them at home, are afflicted every where by those spectacles of calamity which necessarily accompany a state of continued war, and which are to be found in the deserted cottages of peasants and manufacturers, in the tears of aged parents, "weeping for their offspring, because they are not," and amidst the forlorn widows and helpless orphans of their slaughtered countrymen.

That while our youth, at an age and in numbers hitherto unexampled, are ballotted for military service, and seduced or forced away from the useful and meritorious employments of husbandry and trade, your petitioners have to lament the past and approaching ruin of our once opulent merchants, the sudden interruptions given to our once flourishing manufactures, and the melancholy condition of our artizans, formerly, as your petitioners remember, a contented, industrious and honest race, but now disheartened by dreary poverty, degraded by galling dependance, and exposed in many quarters to temptations, by which they may be precipitated into such acts of violence, as would render the forfeiture of their lives a necessary, but most deplorable measure of public justice, for the preservation of the public safety.

That, in addition to these dreadful effects of war, the burden of taxes accumulated and accumulating for the purpose of carrying it on, in countries so remote from each other and with expences so enormous, have raised most exorbitantly the price of provisions, have diverted from circulation the current coin of this realm, have introduced in its stead a fictitious, precarious and fluctuating kind of property in paper, and have filled our Gazettes with bankruptcies, our gaols with debtors, and our numerous workhouses with paupers, who are compelled to flee thither as to a place of refuge, from hunger and thirst, from cold and nakedness, and all the other baleful consequences of unexpected and involuntary exclusion from the daily labours which had supplied their daily bread.

That your petititioners, therefore, upon every principle dear to you and themselves, as Englishmen and as Christians, most earnestly beseech you to direct your attention to the multiplied scenes of private distress and public danger, which characterise the present war, and to employ every mean which the discernment of your honourable house can devise, or its authority can recommend, for the speedy re-establishment of Peace.

At the same time, your petitioners beg leave to assure this honourable house, that the peace which they are solicitous to obtain, is not such an one as should endanger the solid interests or debase the real dignity of their country. The prosperity, liberty, and independence of that country are, in the opinion of your petitioners, inseparable from its glory; and therefore it is in a spirit of steady, considerate, and genuine patriotism alone, that they now prefer to your honourable house their prayer for the restoration of those blessings which peace only can procure, and the importance of which they will think it their duty to urge repeatedly, in those respectful, but firm and serious appeals, which the constitution has authorised them to make, as free-born Britons, to the justice, wisdom and humanity of their representatives in Parliament.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

In the space of the last four-and-twenty years, such convulsions have taken place in Europe, such murders, massacres, conflagrations, that the vials of God's wrath might seem to have been poured out on the throne of the beast: yet, in this period, the last six months have exceeded in horror and anxiety any of the other equal spaces of time. The speculations of the worldly politician have fluctuated from the depth of despair to the summit of exultation. At one time, Europe was laid prostrate, in his imagination, at the foot of the mighty conqueror; at another, he saw him confined in an iron cage, the sport of the semi barbarians of the North, or gaining a scanty subsistence in the wilds of Siberia, or pining away, without compassion, in the dungeons of Petersburgh. With the overthrow of the French conqueror was connected the restoration of every prejudice that had subsisted previous to the Revolution: their nobles, their priests, their lawyers, were to be restored to their ancient pride, superstition and chicanery. Germany was to be divided again into its miserable principalities, the imposture of Popery was to be restored to the Vatican, new monasteries and nunneries were to arise. In short, every thing, good, bad or indifferent, that the French Revolution had swept away, was to be restored on its ancient footing, and mankind were to lament the existence of so much misery to produce no one good whatsoever. But God's ways are not like our ways, nor his thoughts like our thoughts. What will be produced from the mighty earthquake and the following rise of the monster out of the sea, will be duly appreciated by succeeding ages. We who live in these tremendous times look up with confidence in Him, who directs the storm and assuages the raging of the sea, that, miserable as is the departure of Christians in general from the laws of him whom they profess to call their Saviour, his kingdom, the kingdom of peace, shall finally be established, and glory will be acquired, not by acts of desolation, but by services beneficial to society.

A few months ago, the Emperor of France was at the head of an army of between three and four hundred thousand men, of various nations, under his rule or controul, all prepared, in different districts, near the banks of the Niemen, to commence their stupendous operations. The opposing party was not slack in bringing his hordes into the field, and battle followed battle, each vying with the other in horror and carnage, and polluting the earth with more blood than was ever probably shed before in the same space of time and country. The great hero went proudly on from conquest to conquest, till he rushed into the Kremlin, the sanctuary of the Russian empire. A scene of horror was now presented to his view, which might even appal that heart, accustomed, as it had been, to sights of woe and shrieks of despair. The metropolis of a mighty empire was in a blaze around him. Its own inhabitants set fire to the city and consumed the treasures which he vainly called his own. Lord over dust and ashes, the prey had escaped him, and he was now placed in the heart of an empire, where every thing threatened his stay with ruin. The season of the year and the fatigues of the army did not permit an advance to Petersburgh, and nothing but immediate retreat, by the road he came, seemed likely to preserve his army from famine, or a worse enemy, the inclemency of the season.

The causes of the stay in Moscow are not known, nor is it easy to develope them. But whatever they may have been, they had the effect of retarding the retreat to the worst time in which it could be made; for though the fine weather was at first boasted of, the pinching cold and snow attacked them on their march, and the Russians and Cossacks harrassed them at every step. The loss by the weather must have been much greater than by any other cause; yet the Russians boast of having made between twenty and thirty thousand prisoners in three attacks, besides the numbers that were daily brought in of those, who could not keep up with the army, or were taken in various skirmishes, or who abandoned their ranks, preferring the chance of mercy from the enemy to the inevitable horrors of the march. Buonaparte was often reported to be taken or slain; for he was so beset by the armies of Russians in every direction, that it seemed impossible for him to escape. The Russian court issued proclamations of congratulations to their country and gratitude to Providence, on this great deliverance; and when we contemplate the mighty preparations against their country, the skill of the general, the discipline and courage of the soldiers, the whole strikes us as one of those miraculous events, prepared to humble the pride of man. It was not the Russian army that beat Buonaparte; he was conquered by a superior power.

Of three hundred thousand men and upwards, that entered into Russia, not thirty thousand will revisit their country. A hundred and thirty thousand prisoners have been taken, besides arms, ammunition and baggage without end. The plunder gained by the French has all been lost, and their stores accumulated in Poland serve now for food and clothing to the Russian army, which has entered East Prussia and is threatening the whole of Germany. Austria has got back its troops into its own territory, and Alexander has issued a proclamation, calling upon the governments of Europe to withdraw from the influence of France, and to labour with him to establish the balance of power in Europe. He promises to make Prussia again an independent kingdom, but he says nothing of Poland, whose overthrow by the three jacobin powers of Prussia, Russia and Austria, was the forerunner and encourager of all the anarchy that has since prevailed in Europe. It is a great point however that Alexander professes such moderation; for should he enter with his hordes into Europe, should he establish himself at Paris as Buonaparte did at Moscow, many a fair city will be levelled with the ground, barbarism will be re-established, and the strayers from America will visit this quarter of the earth, as we do the plains of Lesser Asia and Greece, to explore their ruins, and to witness the degradation of the human mind under tyranny and superstition.

The mighty Emperor of France, that went proudly from court to court, witnessing the homage of his dependant sovereigns, till he took the command of the most gallant army that the sun perhaps ever shone upon, retraced his steps with the rapidity of the post, out-stripped the news of his disgraces, and, accompanied by a single individual, entered his palace at Paris, unknown and unexpected. Like the arch betrayer of mankind, as described by our great poet, he in disguise mounted his throne. The cannon announced his arrival;

> "loud was the acclaim,
> Forth rush'd in haste the great consulting peers,
> Rais'd from their dark divan, and with like joy,
> Congratulant approach'd him."

But the miserable sovereign had no victorious news to communicate; to their slavish effusions he could answer only in broken hints, dark allusions, forced language. His twenty-ninth bulletin painted, in sufficiently strong colours, the losses of France. It was necessary for him to appear in public; but the silence that accompanied his steps, proclaimed that Buonaparte was no longer the invincible sovereign, and that the staff of his power was broken.

France has been declared to be blotted out of the map of Europe. The wild declaimer, whose ravings had such an effect on this country, little thought that in a few years she would exalt her head, and bring all Europe under her controul. She has suffered another reverse; the flower of her troops is destroyed, her mighty army annihilated. Still let us beware of saying that she is blotted out of the map of Europe. She possesses within herself great resources, and an energy which may still make her formidable, or at any rate prevent her from being an object of contempt. Buonaparte has already astonished Europe by the conceptions of his great mind. At this moment they have not forsaken him. Cast down he is not in despair: he prepares himself for another conflict: he calls boldly on his empire for support: and if his people stand by him, his affairs are far from being irretrievable. His legislative body has been assembled, and his plan, as soon as developed, was adopted. It is great, and if capable of being carried into execution, will effectually preserve France from any irruption by the Russians. A new army is to be raised by means of conscriptions from former years, and this is to amount to three hundred and thirty thousand men. These are to be immediately embodied, and to be prepared for action by the spring. What a call is this upon an empire in which every family has to deplore the loss of a father, a husband, a brother or a son! If it obeys the call, if the men thus summoned march to their depots, Buonaparte may defy the combined arms of Europe against him, and preserve, inviolate the boundaries of his vast dominions.

An army thus formed in an instant must be a subject of great astonishment in this kingdom, where, if a quarter of the number were raised, they could not be organised and disciplined in ten times the time But in France commissions are not bought and sold: and there is no parliamentary influence to secure preferment. If the men will go, the army is made: for so skilfully is every thing military arranged in France, that every man will be in his right post in a very short time after his arrival in the depot. It is to be observed also, that of the men now to be raised, a very great proportion have been employed in the national guard, and are inured to military exercises. When they appear at the depots, corporals, serjeants, and officers will soon be found to a certain degree, and the higher officers will be sent to them from those who have escaped the catastrophe in Russia. An army will be established, if the people have not lost their spirits, and the conflict between the contending emperors may still be terrible.

This is now the time for peace; and perhaps at this moment thoughts of it are entertained. As the emperor of Russia has advanced into Prussia, he will there meet an agent from our court, and if Austria could be persuaded to join them, terms might be laid down, in which Buonaparte might acquiesce. A striking thing in his reverse is, that he has not called his troops from Spain, and he seems to depend upon the country for sufficient supplies. If his people stand by him he will not be browbeaten, and much prudence is required on the opposite side to take advantage of the present circumstances, and not by carrying things with too high a hand, to involve Europe in a still bloodier war. Surely the kings of the earth have learned wisdom by late experience, and peaceable arrangements might be made by very small concessions on either side; but time must prove their spirits, and if the sword continues unsheathed, mankind must rue the folly and wickedness of an age, which boasts of being enlightened.

The affairs of the rest of Europe are swallowed up in the magnitude of the conflict between Russia and France. The king of Prussia is in a strange situation. His troops have quitted the post assigned to them, and have declared themselves neutral, their general being thus guilty of treason, and declared so by his sovereign, who is at heart, most probably, pleased with the act. Austria and the dependant sovereigns of Germany are in perplexity. Whom shall they adhere to? If they quit Buonaparte, their crowns, which they owe to him, may fall from their heads: if they adhere to him, can he protect them, and will they not be crushed by Russia? Sweden will be benefitted, and Denmark will be permitted, perhaps, to remain as it is. Of the new kingdom of Italy we know nothing. The conscription is to be levied in it, and its devotion to the emperor will be tried: and if Naples now resists, there is no one to inforce obedience, and she may, like Sicily, establish a constitution and independance.

Spain is in a very extraordinary position. The French have full controul over the northern and middle parts. The English have retired into Portugal. The Marquis of Wellington has sent home a dreadful account of his army, which in its retreat from Madrid and Burgos perpetrated horrid outrages, and according to his lordship's account, behaved worse, with less reason, than any army he had ever been with, or ever read of. After detailing such an account his lordship went to Cadiz to solicit greater powers. He has been there very splendidly received, but his requests are listened to with no small jealousy. The conduct of the British army has assuredly no tendency to ingratiate us with the Spanish nation, nor do we appear in other respects to be entitled to very great deference from them. Yet, perhaps, Lord Wellington's measure is the best devised for the expulsion of the French from the peninsula, who will evidently retain their ground, as long as partial attacks only are made upon them, and till the whole strength of the nation is brought against them under the guidance of a skilful commander. If the Cortez can bring themselves to make their duke of Ciudad Rodrigo generalissimo, with civil as well as military powers, we have no doubt of beneficial results from such an arrangement: but the jealousy of the Spanish character forbids us to entertain sanguine expectations of such an event, and the war will go on at a monstrous expense to this nation with successive irruptions and retreats of our army.

Of the Spanish colonies we still continue to remain in great ignorance. Buenos Ayres is strong enough to support itself, and the neighbouring kingdom of the Brasils does not venture to interfere in its concerns; but the real state of Lima and Peru is enveloped in great obscurity. Mexico is still united to the old government, that is, the city and a small part of the surrounding territory, but the country at large presents a picture of confusion, which is little inferior to that of Spain The United States, encouraged by their small naval captures, and forgetting the losses of armies, are more firmly united for war. The successes of their privateers have a great influence in this respect, to which may be added the expected assistance from Buonaparte: but, when they hear of his distresses, it is not improbable, that a greater spirit of moderation will prevail. Canada is in a state of security, though it is peopled with Roman Catholics: for they fight just as zealously, as if they professed the religion of the Church of England. The Americans threaten it with another attack Every day, however, shews more and more and more the folly of this unnecessary war, from whichever side of the water it originated.

The Bible Society continues its triumphs. We have already recorded a great one in the city of London, when, in the Egyptian hall, the Lord Mayor presided; and in an assembly of twelve hundred persons, resolutions, proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, were passed unanimously in favour of the diffusion of bibles, without note or comment. A similar meeting has been holden for the city of Westminster, under the patronage of the dukes of York, Kent, Cumberland, Sussex and Cambridge. Lord Teignmouth was in the chair. Lord Castlereagh, a secretary of state, proposed, and Mr. Whitbread seconded the resolutions. Several excellent speeches were made, and scriptural exhortations used upon the occasion. The chief fact of importance divulged was, that an edict of the emperor of China had been brought to this country and translated, which makes it death for any man to introduce a bible into his dominions: but the meeting was exhorted not to despair, as the next emperor, it was hoped, would revoke it. Edicts against Christianity are not uncommon in China, and the emperor probably argues from the lives of Christians, on the tendency of their laws and their books. What, indeed, must be his sentiments, should our newspapers be translated for the use of his cabinet?

What will he think, when he finds that in the nation most zealous for the diffusion of scriptural knowledge, adultery has been termed, in the seat of justice, a misfortune, and in the court of legislation corruption is connived at, because it is notorious as the sun at noon day, and all parties concur in covering, instead of setting themselves in earnest to correct, the evil? How will he estimate the value of our sacred books and our regard for them, if they are really good, when he reads of the atrocious murders committed amongst us, and above all, when he understands, that the disciples of the Prince of Peace have been living in a state of warfare with each other, upwards of twenty years, and are guilty of as great outrages in warfare as the most unenlightened nations? The edict will, we hope, have a place, in due time, in this Repository,* and we shall have a better opinion of the zeal of the members of the Bible Society, if they should be as solicitous to diffuse a correct translation of our sacred books, in the English language, at home, as they are to circulate translations in foreign languages abroad. They know as well as we do, that the bible, which they circulate, is very incorrect; that we possess advantages, which were not known in the time of king James: and it is not to their honour to pay less attention to the best of books, than is paid to the least worthy of the classical writers. We shall not cease to bring this home to the feelings of the members of the Bible Society, whose funds are sufficient, and who possess talents within themselves to give a correct translation from the Hebrew and Greek scriptures, from Kennicott's Bible and Griesbach's Testament, with the helps and improvements, that have been made, or their learning and talents can suggest.

The Catholic question begins to be more noticed in this country than might have been expected. From Ireland petitions on both sides of the question have been frequent, but little has been done on this side of the water. The clergy of the sect established by law, have put themselves in motion, and are uniting in petitions against their brethren, who are less entangled by obedience to the pope than the Established Sect by its thirty nine articles. The clergy of the diocese of Exeter are setting a better example, for they request parliament not to be misled by prejudices, but to take the whole subject into consideration, and to give such relief as is consistent with the welfare of the state. A petition against the Catholics has been vamped up in London by a few people in a tavern, and in one or two vestry meetings; but the general sense of the town has not been taken, either in the council or common hall, or by a meeting in Westminster, nor do we imagine that the Anti-catholics would succeed in any such measure. The general bias seems to be both in and out of parliament, that something should be done, that a committee, at least, should be formed to enquire how far the toleration may be extended, and what real danger is to be apprehended by the admission of men of all religions to the service of the state. This the Established Sect is very much afraid of, for it will then be seen how few they are in number, and how preposterous it is for the sake of a small part of a body consisting of not two-sevenths of the people, the other five-sevenths should be deprived of their rights.

The Catholic bishops of Ireland have published an address to their adherents, in which they declare, that they will not grant faculties of any kind to any clergyman, who has asserted that their afflicted holy father (meaning thereby his pretended holiness, the pope) is a heretic, or a schismatic, or the author, or the abettor of heresy or schism. Also that, as they are at present excluded from any intercourse with their supreme pastor, they feel themselves utterly incapable to propose or agree to any change in the long-established mode of appointing Irish Roman Catholic bishops. In another resolution they state, and with great propriety, that the reverence paid by Roman Catholics to their oaths, is evident, from their not taking those which are appointed by government; and they exhort their flock to continue steadfast in the opinions, held by their forefathers; forgetting to make their appeal to Jesus, the author and completer of our faith. The difficulties in which the papists are placed by the conduct of his present pretended holiness are great: for he is actually stigmatised, by some good Catholics, as a heretic and a schismatic; and his transactions with Buonaparte have been such as to give a strong colour to the charge. Popery has, however, in former times, seen heretical and schismatical popes, and as the adherents to that Anti-christian system did not then, so neither are they likely now, to free themselves from the grossness of its errors.

---

* See p. 62. Ed.

Government has shewn its merciful disposition by the offer of pardon to all the deluded men under the name of Luddites, who have committed such outrages in the north, and who will avail themselves of it by breaking off from the society. Of those who have been taken, many have been freed without trial, whilst of a few an example has been made, that will, we trust, deter others from a perpetration of similar crimes. Tranquillity is thus, apparently at least, restored to the manufacturing counties.

The mercantile interest is fully occupied with the consideration of the East Indian Charter, and the company is set completely in array against the administration. The wisdom of this conduct is not apparent, for the country at large cannot be in favour of monopoly. How can a nation consent to be deprived of all intercourse with the eastern coast of Africa, the whole of Arabia and Persia, the great empires of Cochin China and China, an immense sea coast, in short of many thousand miles, because a company in England has territorial possessions in Hindoostan. At any rate, an Englishman ought to have the liberty of sailing to those kingdoms with which the company carries on little or no trade. Freedom of commerce will benefit the whole empire.

Several meetings have been holden for peace, and petitions prepared for parliament, which breathe a spirit which ought much earlier to have been excited. God's judgments against the wickedness of Europe have been poured out, but do its wretched inhabitants repent of their idolatries, of their abominations? May the advocates for peace continue their efforts, and offer up prayers to the throne of grace, that the effusion of blood may be stopped, that kings may be taught moderation, senators learn wisdom, and the people peace and goodwill towards each other.

CORRESPONDENCE.

We have, as our readers will perceive, extended the present number far beyond our usual limits; we have still, however, a volume of communications lying by us, and must again entreat the patience of our correspondents. Some of them may complain that we have admitted papers posterior in date to their's; but they will recollect that for the making up of our monthly collection, it is necessary not only that we have the given quantity of letter-press, but also that we ensure a variety suited to the taste of a thousand subscribers. At the beginning of a new year it is customary to make good resolutions, and it is one of ours, which we hope we shall be able to keep, not to be so far behind, as we have been for some months, in our Review department: the present number will not, it is true, reflect great credit upon our constancy, but, we trust, the perusal of the foregoing pages will have suggested to the candid reader a sufficient excuse for us.

In the present feverish crisis, when the people in so many places are maddened with bigotry, we lament exceedingly that we are constrained to delay for a moment the insertion of some communications from *Bristol* on the No Popery cry; we shall, however, gratify our readers, by informing them that the next Number will contain the Rev. J. Rowe's energetic and eloquent speech, delivered at the Anti-Catholic meeting at the before-mentioned city, which is consistent, at least, in having refused to be represented, in parliament, by the greatest philanthropist of the age, and in setting up afterwards a fierce opposition to justice, charity and freedom: we shall also insert in the same Number an admirable speech of the Rev. Dr. Estlin's *intended* to have been spoken on the same occasion.

On the subject of *Peace*, as well as *No Popery*, we mean to make the present volume a register of public proceedings. The *Nottingham* and *Hinckley* Resolutions and Petitions are therefore designed for speedy use.

The *Candid Unitarian*, who dates from *Sydenham*, is informed, that the Prize Queries, on which he animadverts, were actually put up in one of the *soi-disant* national schools. Does he persist in offering us *golden guineas*, if we will point out the words *religion* and *virtue* in the Bible?

ERRATUM.

In the last number, Vol. VII. pp. 773, 774, *passim*, for "Cave," read *Kay*.

THE

MONTHLY REPOSITORY

OF

Theology and General Literature.

No. LXXXVI. FEBRUARY. [Vol. VIII.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

Memoir relating to the Estate at Kirkstead, in Lincolnshire, lately recovered to the Dissenters.

Sir, *Lincoln, Jan.* 1, 1813.

A considerable interest having been excited, both in this and in other parts of the country, by a trial which came on at Lincoln, before Judge Grose, at the last summer assize, and that trial having been very falsely reported in some of the London papers, I am anxious that a true statement of it should be given to the public, through the medium of your pages:—and, in order to have the case perfectly understood, I shall beg to offer you a short history of Kirkstead.

The lordship of Kirkstead lies upon the river Witham, at nearly an equal distance from Lincoln and Boston. Here was built, in the year 1139, an abbey for Cistercian monks, the ruins of which are still to be seen. Adjoining the spot on which the ruins stand, but beyond the ditch which once surrounded them, with a small pasture field intervening, is a chapel, supposed to be one of the oldest buildings in Lincolnshire. Its windows lofty and narrow, and pointed upwards, in the form of a spear, indicate that it was built before the general use of glass, that is, before the twelfth century; and the tradition respecting its antiquity, which is current in the neighbourhood, is, that it had an existence before the abbey.

The property of the Cistercian monks was held under great and peculiar advantages, having been exempted from all ecclesiastical and parish taxes; and, at the suppression, it was given away, with all its privileges. There are many of these estates in the neighbourhood of Lincoln: they are extra-parochial and extra-episcopal; of course, they have no parish church, they are allied to no parish, and pay no tithes nor church lays.

The lordship of Kirkstead was given, at the Conquest, by William, to one of his Norman generals, of the name of Eudo; and in the chapel is a stone figure, imbossed, still in good preservation, of a man in complete armour. This stood originally in an erect posture, against the wall, but was laid down, as a paving stone, with the image towards the earth, till it was discovered, upon the new paving of the chapel, by some one who had more veneration for the monuments of antiquity, and, under his direction, it was again placed erect, against the wall, at the entrance, but, unfortunately, the head of the figure could not be found. — It is not improbable, therefore, that the chapel was built at that very early period, for the use of the general's family, and that his own bones were deposited within it.

At the suppression of the convents, the lordship fell into the hands of the family of the Earl of Lincoln, and was held by a descendant of that family, of the name of Fines, about the year 1680. About this time, the heiress of the family was married to Mr. Daniel Disney, a zealous nonconformist, who, becoming proprietor of the estate, removed, in 1685, and took possession of the manor-house. We learn that, shortly after this, dissenting worship was performed in the chapel, by a gentleman of the name of Reed, to whom the lord of the manor paid, at his own pleasure, an annual stipend. We have no means of ascertaining whether any Protestant minister officiated in the chapel before Mr. Reed, but it is probable there were ministers earlier. The pulpit is a venerable piece of antiquity, and bears its age, marked conspicuously at the back, 1620. But the oldest Bible belonging to the chapel, was given by Mr. Disney, the father of Daniel, in the year 1699; and one was also given by Mrs. Fines, in 1672.— It appears, therefore, that Protestant worship may have been first celebrated there under the auspices of Mr. Disney, a nonconformist, before whose time, we may venture to presume, there was no Bible in the chapel.

It is not a little extraordinary, that in the register book of the marriages, baptisms and burials, not only Mr. Reed but his successors, and among them Andrew, afterwards Dr., Kippis, affixed to their names the title of curate. Mr. Taylor, who removed from thence to Norwich, well known as Dr. Taylor, the author of the Hebrew Concordance, succeeded Mr. Reed, as minister at Kirkstead; settled there in 1714, and left it in 1733; and, in this obscure corner, this silent retreat, he laboured hard at his stupendous work. About this time, in the year 1720, Mr. Daniel Disney, concerned to see that the people residing about his estate were excluded from the chance of religious instruction, unless he and his heirs should chuse to provide a minister for them; and, fearing to trust to the benevolence of his descendants, and even to his own stability, came to the pious determination of securing the advantages of religious instruction to the tenants of his lordship, by appointing a trust of five persons, in whom he would vest certain pieces of land, of the then value of 33l. per annum, for the permanent support of Presbyterian worship in that place, and at his death, he confirmed the grant by will, and also gave the chapel, for the use of the Dissenting ministers, who should be chosen according to the instructions of the deed of trust. A Mr. Harrison, who removed to Diss, in Norfolk, came to Kirkstead when Mr. Taylor quitted it, and was succeeded, in the year 1759, by Mr. Dunkley. This gentleman continued in the faithful discharge of his ministerial duties, as a light shining in a dark place, for five and thirty years, and was seized on Christmas day, 1793, with a fit, which terminated in his death, in the yard of his chapel, and amongst the bones of his parishioners, whom he there had laid to rest.

A few years before the death of Mr. Dunkley, the estate was sold by Mr. Fytche Disney to Richard Ellison, Esq. member of Parliament for the city of Lincoln. This gentleman had not been long in possession when he assiduously courted the friendship of Mr. Dunkley, and in a manner of which it will best become us to be silent, prevailed on the old gentleman, to accept him, by a deed, previously got ready, as his tenant to all the pieces of land, which he held in capacity of minister. But if we cannot explain the process by which Mr. Dunkley was persuaded to lease out the land to Mr. Ellison, we can, from the testimony of many now living, state the effect that transaction produced on the health and spirits of Mr. D. He was scarcely ever seen to smile afterwards; he declared that he had done what he was ashamed of, and that he should never more have a happy hour: in short, he was ever after an unhappy man.

The trustees who were living at Mr. Dunkley's death, resided in distant counties, and did not, for some years afterwards, hear of that event, and, of course, took no stepts to appoint a successor to him. Of this Mr. Ellison took the advantage, and, under the pretence that the inhabitants of Kirkstead preferred a clergyman of the Church of England, made an agreement with a gentleman of of that description, who lived a few miles off, to do duty to them once on the Sunday, for which he should receive from him 30l. per annum, the sum left by Mr. Disney, in the year 1720, while he held the land himself, having parcelled it out in the most convenient form for the benefit of himself and his tenants. At this period, which was seventy years after the original grant, our readers will know that the chapel lands must have been of more than double the value of 1720. Thus it happened that Mr. Ellison was suffered to appoint a clergyman of the Church of England to do duty in a place of worship, which had been expressly given, out of a gentleman's private estate, to the Presbyterians; and while he paid that gentleman 30*l.* a year for his duty, to put more than as much into his own pocket, from the proceeds of an estate, definitely given to Dissenting trustees, for the purpose of supporting Dissenting worship.

It happened that a gentleman was appointed in the year 1806, to an official post in Lincoln, and one of the first acts he was called to was, to recover from this identical estate of Kirkstead, a legacy of 6l. a year, which had been left by Mr. Disney, but kept back for fifteen years by the then holder of the estate. This circumstance naturally led to an enquiry about the Kirkstead living; and although scarcely a ray of light could at first be found, to guide to an investigation, with the concurrence of the Dissenting Committee*, in London, the indefatigable exertions of their very able solicitor, and the friendly and anxious vigilance of a distinguished barrister and sergeant, ejectments were at length served, and the action was defended by Mr. Ellison, in July last at Lincoln. A great mass of evidence had been collected, which not only went to prove the right vested in the trustees, but also to throw blame where blame has been most conspicuously due. But it was not thought necessary, by the counsel who were employed, to go into it. The legal title was proved from the original trust-deeds, the discovery of which, in a very unexpected manner, rendered the action perfectly safe; and it was the opinion of Mr. Justice Grose, that no doubt existed, as to its being in the trustees, and that, therefore, a verdict must be given for the plaintiffs. A legal objection, however arose, upon a point which is of peculiar interest to the trustees of Dissenting chapels, and, indeed, to all trustees of public charities. The original trustees had all died without having complied with the intention of the donor, that when two were dead, the other three should renew the trust; and the heir at law of the surviving trustee renewed it in the year 1761. A similar irregularity was also discovered, in the other renewals, in 1772, and 1793, when only two trustees survived. It was argued upon this, that the terms not having been complied with, the trust had been made void, and the property had reverted into the estate. The judge, however, was of opinion, that the legal estate was in the heir at law of the surviving trustee, who had a power to renew the trust; therefore that his renewal was valid; but allowed the defendant to make it a case for the judges, if, on more mature consideration, he should think it desirable to do so. The question respecting the estate being thus settled, the defendant's counsel next endeavoured to prove, that the chapel was a parish church, and could not be given away by any individual, and put into the hands of the Dissenters. The proofs offered were, that there is a bell to call the people to worship, a very old font used for baptism, registers of marriages, births and deaths, church-wardens and overseers, a pulpit, older than the time in which Dissenters have been known, and the ministers have usually called themselves curates.—Had the counsel on the side of the plaintiffs thought it proper, they might easily have shewn, that these are no proofs of its being a parish church, and that, in point of fact, it has never been regarded in that light, but always as a Dissenting meeting, licensed according to law: but they thought it best to wave a reply, seeing that the feelings of the court were against them; and under their suggestions the plaintiffs thought it most prudent to take a verdict for the estate, and defer the question of their right to the chapel for another assize*.

---

* Of Deputies.—Ed.

Farther Particulars respecting the Family of the Disneys.

In the year 1692, a small book was published by Mr. Daniel Disney, with an introductory address to the reader, by the Rev. Samuel Slater. It was written by Mr. Gervase Disney, and dedicated "to his dear wife, honoured mother, brothers, sisters and near relations and friends." The title of it is "Some remarkable Passages in the Life of Mr. Gervase Disney"; it was collected from his Diary, and methodized by himself, with a view to publication.

---

* Since the above was written, Mr. Reader moved the Court of King's Bench for a new trial, stating his grounds before Lord Ellenborough: I presume they were the illegality of the trusts, which had not been filled up agreeably to the instructions of the donor. But his lordship, without asking any explanation, or taking the opinion of Mr. Justice Grose, who sat by his side, gave for answer, that there was not sufficient reason for granting a new trial.

It appears from this little book, that Gervase was the second son of Mr. John Disney, of Swinderby, in Lincolnshire; his father had several sons and daughters. He writes, "As to my brother Daniel, he married, pretty young, Katherine, one of the daughters of Henry Fines, of Kirkstead, Esq. a co-heir." In June 1685, he writes that "his brother Daniel had just come down to his house at Kirkstead."

There are in it many passages which prove that this family were zealous nonconformists.

Mr. Gervase Disney was born in 1641, and received his education under two nonconformist ministers. He was highly delighted, after he settled in London, with the services of Mr. Flavel, on whom he regularly attended, till this worthy divine was thrown into prison, where he died of the plague. He acknowledges and laments the wildness of his youthful career, although it appears from his own remarks, that he was guilty of indiscretions rather than of crimes. He observes, "While at Barkston, to which my father moved, for the sake of religious worship under Mr. Trott, I went sometimes to Grantham, to hear some nonconformist ministers, as there was opportunity of their preaching, which was but seldom. Much soul advantage I received then, through the Lord's blessing, upon Mr. Sharp's ministry, who was then a nonconformist of very great note. After this, my father buying a house at Lincoln, we removed there, and attended the ministry of Mr. Abdy, who was pastor of the congregation when liberty was given by the king's proclamation." He afterwards removed to Nottingham, where Mr. Whitlock, Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Barrett were the ministers.

P. 66,—"Several troubles I met with on account of my nonconformity:"—he lodged the ministers at his house, and had many fines to pay in consequence of it. He afterwards fell under the sentence of excommunication, and expected that a writ would be taken out to arrest him. He then removed to Ollercarr, and sat under the preaching of Mr. Coats. About this time, much trouble befel him, in consequence of a letter which his brother Daniel had written him in characters, which was stopped by the magistrates of Nottingham, and sent up to court. It was supposed to be the Duke of Monmouth's Declaration, who had just at that time landed in the west. He then absconded, running great risks of being arrested and imprisoned, under the charge of holding a correspondence with the Duke.

In Mr. Slater's Preface, he says of him, that he wrote characters so well as to take down the whole sermon, and read it, verbatim, to his family, in the evening.

The same zealous regard to nonconformity animated Mr. Daniel Disney, the donor of the estate in question; which evidently appears, not merely from the grant itself, but also, more strongly, in a paper written by his own hand, to be inclosed in and accompany, the trust deeds.

The property thus recovered, consists of a hundred and forty acres of land, with a farm and public house upon it. I. W.

Historical Account of the Warrington Academy.

(*Continued from p.* 5.)

In the course of the summer of 1757, the Committee were busily employed in making arrangements for obtaining suitable accommodations for the several tutors, and a public hall, library and class-rooms, with a view to the commencement of the first session, early in the autumn of the same year. Accordingly, a range of buildings, at the north-west end of the bridge, was engaged, to which was attached a considerable extent of garden-ground, and a handsome terrace-walk, on the banks of the Mersey; possessing, altogether, a respectable collegiate appearance. Here the Academy continued for several years.

In their endeavours to collect a library, in some degree correspondent to the extensive plan contemplated in the institution of the Academy, the Trustees were particularly favoured. Besides several private benefactions of considerable value, (particularly from Mr. James Percival, of Liverpool, afterwards of Warrington, and from Mr. Henry Kendall, of Ulverstone,) Mr. Richard Grosvenor, son of the venerable Dr. Benjamin Grosvenor, of London, made an offer, which was thankfully accepted, of the fine collection of his venerable father, on condition that they should be vested in the hands of trustees, in such a manner, that they might never become private property, but that, in all future time, if any unfavourable event should attend this institution, they might be transferred to some other Dissenting academy; at the same time, allowing a liberty to dispose of duplicates, or of such books as were not immediately useful for the design, provided that the money arising from such sale, should be employed in the purchase of other books, which should also be esteemed a part of the Dr.'s library. But a still more important acquisition was made of the valuable library of the Rev. Samuel Stubbs*, which his brother, Mr. Stubbs of Longdon, near Litchfield, was pleased to signify his favourable inclination, to have employed for the use of the academy, on condition that, upon the failure of the institution, they should be returned to him, or otherwise disposed of as he should direct, for the promotion of literature among Protestant Dissenters. These two large collections have continued to form the basis of the library at Warrington, at Manchester, and now at York; in favour of which last institution the surviving representative of the Stubbs family, has lately, in the handsomest manner, relinquished all claim to, and control over, her uncle's books. Considerable additions have, from time to time, been made, as well out of the funds of the institution, as in the form of benefactions from various persons, (particularly from Samuel

---

* May it not be a worthy subject of the enquiries of your Birmingham correspondents, to endeavour to ascertain where this gentleman was educated, and where he was a minister? From the number and variety of valuable works which he had collected, and the important notes and references, interspersed in the margins of many of them, he was probably a man of considerable learning and curious research.

Shore, and the late Sydney Hollis Foy, Esqrs.; and, since its removal to York, from the venerable Theophilus Lindsey, and Marmaduke Constable, Esq.); so that it is now become a very extensive and valuable library: it is still, however, deficient in many important respects. It were to be wished that a correct catalogue of its contents were printed; and if the *desideranda*, in the several classes, were added in italics, it would serve as a guide, as well to the Committee of the institution in the application of their own funds, as to those who might be disposed to assist it by benefactions. Many persons would then find, on a comparison of such a catalogue with their own, that several books were wanting in it of which they had duplicates, or which they might not particularly value; executors also, or other representatives of deceased persons, might thus be furnished with an easy method of enriching this library, without any, or with the least possible loss to survivors.

On the 20th of October, 1757, the trustees held a general meeting, at which the two tutors already elected, produced their plan of tuition, and their regulations for the government of the academy; and on the 23d, it was opened, for the first month with three students only, who were afterwards increased to five, the whole number during the first year; the two tutors dividing between them, during this first session, the business intended for the third tutor, Dr. Taylor taking the classics and moral philosophy, and Mr. Holt, logic, metaphysics and history.

Perhaps the present may be as convenient a place as any for attempting to state the manner in which Dr. Taylor executed the duties of his office as a tutor in divinity, as far as it can be ascertained at such a distance of time.

From the high character which he justly bore, as a consummate Hebrew scholar, it may be presumed that he would be very careful thoroughly to ground his pupils in the knowledge of this sacred tongue. This appears accordingly to have been the case: from the papers with which the present writer has been favoured by the Rev. Thomas Astley, of Chesterfield, his only surviving pupil in these branches of learning, it is evident that, in addition to the ordinary modes of grammatical instruction, he drew out for them, and caused them to copy and get by heart, a sort of sacred vocabulary, containing copious and elaborate lists of the various Hebrew denominations of persons, things, relations, qualities, &c. distinguishing the various synonyms, with their different shades of meaning, and often supplying the correspondent Greek terms in the Septuagint and New Testament. He afterwards gave them a course of lectures, on the idiomatic phraseology of the Hebrew Scriptures; at the same time pointing out the influence which these idioms frequently have upon the Greek of the New Testament, and the necessity of being acquainted with, and constantly attending to, them, in order to obtain a just idea of the exact sense of many passages in the New Testament writers. The rules and observations contained in these lectures, were illustrated by a vast number of quotations from both parts of the sacred volume, as well as by many from the

Greek and Latin classics. They professed to be chiefly an abridgment, or rather a reduction to order of the substance of Glassius's *Philologia Sacra;* but were enriched with many additions from other sources, as well as from the Dr.'s own stores. They were afterwards enlarged by Dr. Aikin, particularly by copious references to Lowth's Prælections on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews; and were occasionally repeated, (generally once, at least, in the course of each divinity-student's term of residence,) during the period in which he filled the theological chair; on which occasions they were perpetually enlivened by various incidental illustrations, which his extensive acquaintance with the poetry of all nations, enabled him to give, in the happy extemporaneous manner in which he certainly excelled all other lecturers. An imperfect copy of these lectures is in the hands of the present writer. If a perfect copy could be made out, their publication might even yet be an acceptable present to the Biblical student; although their necessity is in a good degree superseded by such works as Gerard's Institutes of Biblical Criticism, and the works there referred to.

Besides these lectures in regular course, Dr. Taylor appears to have been in the habit of occasionally delivering detached critical dissertations on a more enlarged plan; as, for instance, on the various scriptural senses of particular words, as of רוח in the Old Testament, compared with Πνευμα in the New; Χαρις, Πας, &c. Sketches of several of these dissertations appear among Mr. Astley's papers.

When he had thus thoroughly grounded his pupils in the languages of both Testaments, and probably read with them a considerable portion of each, he led them through a regular course of theological lectures; for which purpose he drew up, as a text-book, his "Scheme of Scripture Divinity," which was printed for the use of the students, at the expence of the Trustees of the Academy; and, after his death, was published to the world at large, by his son, Mr. Richard Taylor, of Norwich. It has since been admitted by Bishop Watson, into his Collection of Theological Tracts; and it is certainly a very learned and valuable work, although by no means so perfect as its author, had he lived, would probably have made it. The general idea is certainly excellent, of studying the Divine dispensations historically. The introduction contains a series of observations, on the whole very judicious, on Christian theology, on the rules to be observed in interpreting the scriptures, and on the dispositions which it is necessary that the student should bring with him, to their successful investigation. Then follow some remarks on the Divine dispensations, in which among much good, there is, it must be confessed, some share of fancy, with regard to several particulars. The author then proceeds to a particular view of the creation; the institution of the Sabbath; the paradisiacal state of trial; the fall and its consequences (interweaving here his Treatise on Original Sin); the origin of sacrifices; the shechinah; the deluge; the dispersion from Babel; the patriarchal religion, exemplified in the Book of Job, its corruption; the call of Abraham, and the covenant of grace with him (referring to his pamphlet so called); its commencement in the separation of the people of Israel, with the methods of the Divine wisdom in this important dispensation, (more fully enlarged on, in his Key to the Apostolic Writings); the civil government and ritual of the Hebrews, (Lowman referred to), its rational and spiritual meaning; the sacrifical part of it (more fully explained in his Scripture Doctrine of Atonement.)—He then gives a general review of the authors and what they teach, from the Exodus to the building of the temple: from thence to its destruction, by Nebuchadnezzar: the moral causes of the captivity, and the purposes answered by it: the authors in both these periods, particularly the prophets, chronologically arranged. Then, after a view of the state of the world at the coming of Jesus Christ, he refers to his treatise on the Lord's Supper, for his thoughts on the excellent character of Christ, and on the divine principles, doctrine and spirit of the gospel.

Thus far the work was printed by the Dr. himself, and employed by him as his text-book, in his lectures to the students. He always prefaced his lectures, we are informed by the editor of the enlarged posthumous edition, with the following solemn charge: "I do solemnly charge you, in the name of the God of Truth, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the way, the truth and the life, and before whose judgment-seat you must in no long time appear, 1st, that in all your studies and inquiries of a religious nature, present or future, you do constantly, carefully, impartially and conscientiously, attend to evidence, as it lies in the holy scriptures, or in the nature of things, and the dictates of reason; cautiously guarding against the sallies of imagination, and the fallacy of ill-grounded conjecture. 2, That you admit, embrace, or assent to, no principle or sentiment, by me taught or advanced, but so far as it shall appear to you to be supported and justified by proper evidence from revelation, or the reason of things. 3, That if, at any time hereafter, any principle or sentiment by me taught or advanced, or by you admitted and embraced, shall, upon impartial and faithful examination, appear to you to be dubious or false, you either suspect or totally reject such principle or sentiment. 4, That you keep your mind always open to evidence; that you labour to banish from your breast all prejudice, prepossession, and party-zeal; that you study to live in peace and love with your fellow-Christians; and that you steadily assert for yourself, and freely allow to others, the unalienable rights of judgment and conscience."—It seems impossible, as the editor justly observes, to adjust the terms between a tutor and his pupils more equitably. And yet it is understood to have been the general impression on the minds of those who attended his lectures that, notwithstanding his amiable dispositions and agreeable manners in the general intercourses of life, in his class-room his manner was somewhat dictatorial, and while he invited them to judge for themselves, he was not very patient of contradiction. This may, perhaps, be accounted for without much ground for censure, or for at all impeaching his sincerity as to the principle of free inquiry which he charged his pupils to maintain. Having devoted his whole time, through the course of a large portion of his life, to an examination of the sacred scriptures, which his works will shew to have been patient, severe and unremitted, and which we may well presume to have been impartial, for its results were against both early prepossessions and present interest, he had been engaged, throughout the latter half of it, in publishing these results, in various elaborate publications. During this period, also, he was under the necessity of continuing his researches, and of further examining the ground of his former conclusions, by frequent calls to maintain that ground against numerous able opponents; he was also engaged in inculcating his principles from the pulpit, with great reputation and success: and he was now to engage, at the age of sixty-three, in the important office of training up young men for the Christian ministry, and in order to this, of leading them to a just and rational acquaintance with the principles of Christian doctrine, founded upon an enlarged and accurate knowledge of the scriptures. Impressed with the importance of this service, he drew up his Scheme of Scripture-Divinity, in which he appears to have had it in view, to collect into one treatise, the results of the inquiries of his whole life, interweaving, as he proceeded, his various detached pieces, so as to present before his pupils, the whole of his labours on the sacred volume, as it were at one view. To his own judgment, after the strictest revisal, the principles which he had adopted were perfectly just and entirely scriptural; and appearing to him as plain (as he sometimes told them,) "as that two and two made four," he could not always brook the (probably sometimes) flippant remarks of the young men, who themselves, perhaps, not always relishing the close confinement, which he required to his elaborate Hebrew criticisms, might occasionally, forget the deference which became them, to such superior age and learning. May it be permitted, without offence, to hazard a suspicion, that this might, not unnaturally, be the case with those, who removed, at an advanced period of their course, to Warrington, from Daventry; where, as Dr. Priestley informs us*, "they were indulged in the greatest freedoms," and where, having been accustomed to be referred, indiscriminately, to writers on all sides of every question† they were not content with being seldom referred to any but the Dr.'s own writings. His jealousy on this score might also be increased by a suspicion that such discontents were fomented by others, who he imagined, perhaps with little foundation, were taking pains to impress the minds of his pupils with different sentiments on theological and moral subjects. For it cannot be concealed, that considerable misunderstandings took place between Dr. Taylor and several persons, who had been actively engaged in establishing the academy, and in promoting his removal from Norwich. After a careful perusal of a great variety of papers on both sides, the writer of these notes is of opinion, that there was much misapprehension and some blame on each side; but, as a complete knowledge of all the circumstances on either side cannot now be obtained, and, if it could, would be of little use, since the institution is dissolved, and the disputants have long since left the world, it seems desirable to suffer the whole to rest in oblivion. However this be, the uneasiness occasioned by these disputes, the change of scenes, of acquaintances, of business, perhaps of climate, and the extreme ill-health of Mrs. Taylor, had such an effect upon a constitution naturally robust, that he died in the spring of 1761, near the close of the fourth session of the academy.

---

* Memoirs, p. 17, 20.

† Whether this plan of indiscriminate reference to writers on all the controversies of the day, is not, in Doddridge's Lectures, pushed to an extreme, and has not a natural tendency to generate a sceptical, or else a disputatious spirit, will perhaps admit of a doubt.

To the edition of the "Scripture Divinity," published after his death, were appended some excellent chapters, containing remarks on the expediency of revelation, replies to various objections against it, observations on the original and authority, the harmony and agreement, the internal worth and excellence of the scriptures, and the thankful esteem with which Christians ought to receive and practically improve them.

V. F.

[To be continued.]

EXTRACTS FROM NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Richards's History of the Royal Touch.

[Continued from p. 11.]

Edward VI. Henry's amiable son and successor, is not known to have been at all an adept at this princely practice, or even to have been in the least partial to it. He probably thought so very lightly of it as entirely to omit and discard it, as he is also said to have done with respect to the *consecration of cramp rings*, by which his royal father so much distinguished himself. It is likely that Edward, young as he was, had imbibed some sectarian notions, which might unfit him for the performance of these sublime operations. Even the royal and episcopal work of *burning heretics*, so much approved of and delighted in by his predecessors, and afterwards by his immediate successor, and so much called for and applauded by ecclesiastics, was to him an object of utter aversion; and if he once suffered it to be done, it was involuntary and against his own better judgment, through the importunate entreaties and urgent expostulations of his bishops, and particularly Cranmer, to whom therefore the guilt and infamy of the deed must properly or chiefly belong*. There is reason to believe that no such doings would have sullied or disgraced his reign, had he been left to judge and act for himself. It is probable he was left so to judge and act with respect to the *royal touch;* so that we need not be surprised at his declining the practice.

---

* So little did those reformers know of the *spirit* of Christianity: and yet they are still held up, by a numerous and powerful religious party among us, as patterns of orthodoxy and pure religion: as if those men who knew the least of the spirit of Christ, and the principles of common justice, were most likely to know most of the doctrines and precepts of the gospel, and be of all men the fittest to follow; or as if that religion should be the most orthodox, pure

From *Mary*, his bloody sister and successor, a different conduct might be expected: and her conduct certainly was, almost in every thing, very different from his. Superstitious as she was, and bigoted to the last degree, it is not to be supposed that she should shrink from the performance of any rite or ceremony, however absurd, that had been in request with her Popish predecessors, or devoutly practised by them. This of the *royal touch* could never escape her attention: nay, it is expressly said that the office was indeed fairly written out for her use; [that very office probably, which has been above inserted;] so that there can be no question of her touching for the evil, as devoutly and as successfully perhaps, as any of the rest*.

As to *Elizabeth*, heretic as she was, her legitimacy questioned, and her title litigated, she *touched* for the evil, with a success acknowledged even by the Papists themselves, who are said to ascribe it to the *sign of the cross.** A case is mentioned by *Carte*, of a Roman Catholic, who, being put into prison, perhaps for recusancy, and terribly afflicted with the evil, was, after he had been there a tedious time, at a vast expence of physicians, without the least relief, *touched* by this queen, and perfectly cured: which gave him occasion to say, he was now convinced, by undoubted experience, that the Pope's excommunication of her signified nothing, since she still continued blessed with so miraculous a quality.†—It was well for the poor fellow that he was not a *puritan*, or he might have gone long enough without his cure, as her majesty is known to have been inexorably pitiless and spiteful against that class of her subjects.

Of *James* I, with his strong faith in ghosts and witches, and lofty notions of indefeasible right, royal prerogative and king-craft, it was not to be supposed that he, of all men, would think meanly or lightly of this royal and religious operation. It accordingly appears that he very readily and warmly engaged in it, and actually became a most dexterous and eminent practitioner, to the no small satisfaction and comfort, as we may suppose, of his liege subjects, as well as advancement of his own fame, or at least, the gratification of his vanity, of which it is well

---

and estimable, that shews the least of the spirit of the New Testament, and even allows of intolerance, persecution and murder.

* Her conduct, in torturing and burning those whom she deemed *heretics*, cannot well be thought more diabolical or execrable than that of her successors, *Elizabeth* and *James*, toward those whom they viewed in a similar light: the latter *burnt* them, as *Mary* did, and no less cruelly and unjustly; and the former imprisoned, tortured, hanged, embowelled and quartered them. This was the good queen Bess. Her whole bench of bishops, all of the right reformed and *evangelical* stamp, applauded her deeds.

* That part of the ceremony, however, appears to have been expunged in the next reign, and discontinued afterwards till that of James II. without any diminution of the effect. See *Occasional Thoughts*, as before, 62.

† Carte, i. 357.

known he possessed no common or scanty portion. Nothing could delight him more than the idea that he could work miracles: his courtiers called him *Solomon;* but that idea was calculated to make him think himself as still greater than even Solomon. We are not informed how many patients underwent or felt his royal touch; but there is every reason to suppose and believe that the number must have been very considerable.

His unfortunate son and successor, *Charles* I. was no less distinguished in this same way than his royal father had been. Great numbers are said to have been by him both touched and cured; of whom not a few were little children, which has been urged as a proof that it could not be ascribed to the effect or strength of imagination. Carte observes, that Dr. Heylyn, an eye-witness of such cures, says, "I have seen some children brought before the king, by the hanging sleeves, some hanging at their mothers' breasts, and others in the arms of their nurses, all cured without the help of a serviceable imagination."* Both Heylyn and Carte were full of faith in these miracles. If they were right, the decapitation of Charles must have been a great loss to the nation, and especially to those who were afflicted with the evil. For twelve years or more, after that event, not one of these miracles appears to have been wrought in this country.

As to *Oliver Cromwell*, it does not appear that he ever tried his hand at this wonder-working operation; conscious, it may be supposed, that it did not belong to his province; or to the protectoral office and dignity, with which he was invested. What he would have done, had he accepted or assumed the regal title, cannot be said or known with absolute certainty: though the probability seems to bear against his even then becoming a practitioner, as it would hardly have met the approbation of his best friends, or accorded with the ideas of his most trusty and powerful coadjutors, or even with his own.

After a total cessation or suspension of this ancient princely practice, during the whole time of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, it revived again at the memorable *Restoration;* and *Charles* II. took it up vigorously and solemnly, and on a very extensive scale. The Register of the Royal Chapel is said to exhibit a list of 92,107 persons touched by him for the evil in a certain number of years,* not including, it seems, the whole of his reign; so that double that number, or more, for aught we know, may have passed under his hand during the whole course of his government. Yet we find he practised only at some particular seasons of the year; at least after the summer of 1662, when a royal proclamation was issued, to inform the public that such would be the case from thenceforth. His majesty had been then a practitioner full two years, during which time, there is reason to believe that he had touched some thousands. He began the work almost immediately after his restoration, so that it may be considered among the first acts of his reign. Of the state of the practice in his royal hands, or under his wise management, a pretty accurate idea may be formed from the following extracts, out of some of the principal public papers of that era.

---

* Carte, i. 358, note.

* Athenæum, No. 4.

The following passage appeared in the weekly paper called *Mercurius Politicus*, of June 28, 1660: — "Saturday being appointed by his majesty to touch such as are troubled by the evil, a great number of poor afflicted creatures were met together, many brought in chairs and flaskets; and being appointed by his majesty to repair to the Banqueting House, his majesty sat in a chair of state, and stroked all that were brought to him, and then put about each of their necks a white ribbon with an angel of gold on it. In this manner his majesty stroked above 600; and such was his princely patience and tenderness to the poor afflicted creatures, that though it took up a very long time, his majesty, never weary of well doing, was pleased to make enquiry, whether there were any more who had not been touched. After prayers were ended, the duke of Buckingham brought a towel, and the earl Pembroke a bason and ewer; who, after they had made obeysance to his majesty, kneeled down till his majesty had washed." —This was within a month after his majesty's arrival.

The next is from the *Parliamentary Journal*, of July 9, 1660; a fortnight after the other, and is thus curiously worded:—"The kingdom having for a long time been troubled with the evil, by reason of his majesty's absence, great numbers have flocked for cure. His sacred majesty, on Monday last, touched 250 in the Banqueting-House; among whom, when his majesty was delivering the gold, one shuffled himself in, out of a hope of profit, which had not been stroked; but his majesty presently discovered him, saying, this man has not yet been touched. His majesty hath for the future appointed every Friday for the cure, at which time 200 and no more are to be presented to him, who are first to repair to *Mr. Knight*, the king's surgeon, living at the Cross-Guns, in Russell Street, Covent Garden, over against the Rose Tavern, for their tickets. — That none might lose their labour, he thought fit to make it known, that he will be at his house every Wednesday and Thursday, from two till six of the clock, to attend that service.—And if any *person of quality* shall send to him he will wait upon them at their lodgings, upon notice given to him."—In the same paper of July 30, and August 6, notice was given, that no more would be touched till about Michaelmas: and in the *Mercurius Politicus*, of February 28, 1661, it is said, that *many came twice or thrice, for the sake of the gold.*

Another weekly paper, called *Mercurius Publicus*, of February 21, 1661, had the following passage:—"We cannot but give notice, that certain persons (too many one would think) who, having the king's evill, and have been *touched* by his *sacred majesty*, have got the forehead to come twice or thrice, alleging they were never there before, till divers witnesses proved the contrary; which hath forced his *majesty* to give order that whosoever, hereafter, comes to be touched, shall first bring to his *majesty's* chirurgeons a certificate from the *minister* and church-wardens, (where they live,) that they never were touched by his *majesty* before: the next healing will begin six weeks hence."

In the same paper of May 9, 1661, appeared the following notice or advertisement:—"*Whitehall.* We are commanded to give notice, that his *majesty* finds the season already so hot, that it will be neither safe nor fit to continue his healing such as have the king's evil; and therefore that his *majesty's* good subjects therein concerned, would at present forbear to come to court; Friday next (May 10,) and Wednesday (May 15,) being the last days that his *majesty* intends to heal, till the heat of the weather be allayed, and his *majesty's* further pleasure known, whereof his good subjects shall have timely notice."

The same paper of August 15, 1661, contained the passage following:—"We are commanded to give notice, that his *majesty* finds the season such, that it will neither be safe nor fit to continue his healing those that have the king's evil; and therefore that his *majesty's* good subjects therein concerned do forbear to come to court till All-saints day next, till which time his *majesty* doth not intend to heal."

In the very same paper, of July 17, 1662, appeared the following curious courtly advertisement:—"*Hampton Court.* His majesty lately set forth a *Proclamation for the better ordering of those who repair to the court for cure of the disease called the king's evil,* wherein his majesty being as ready and willing to relieve the necessities and diseases of his good subjects by his sacred touch, which shall come for cure, as any of his royal predecessors, in which, by the grace and blessing of God, he hath in an extraordinary measure had good success, and yet, in his princely wisdom, foreseeing that fit times are necessary to be appointed for the performing of that great work of charity, doth declare his royal pleasure to be, that from henceforth the usual times for presenting such persons, shall be from the feast of *All-saints*, commonly called *Allhallowtide*, to a week before *Christmas*, and in the month before *Easter*, being more convenient for the temperature of the season, and in respect of any contagion that may happen in this near access to his majesty's sacred person. His majesty doth further command, that none presume to repair to court for cure of the said disease, but within the limits appointed, and that such persons who come for that purpose, bring certificates under the hands of the parson, vicar, or minister and church-wardens of the parishes where they dwell, testifying that they have not at any time before been touched by the king; further charging all justices of peace, constables, &c. that they suffer not any to pass but such as have such certificates, under pain of his majesty's displeasure. And that his majesty's subjects may have the better knowledge of it, his majesty's will is, that this proclamation be published and affixed in some open place in every market town of this realm."

To the above extracts, only one more shall be here added, from another public paper called *The Newes*, of May 18, 1664.—"His sacred majesty having declared it to be his royal will and purpose to continue the healing of his people for the evil during the month of May, and then give over till Michaelmas next, I am commanded to give notice thereof, that the people may not come up to the town in the interim, and lose their labour."*

From these premises it plainly appears that the king really pretended to be endowed with the power or gift of working miracles, and of healing or curing one of the most obstinate and incurable diseases incident to the human frame, even by his *touch*. Most curious and ludicrous it surely must be, to see such a man as Charles making such a pretension, and affecting to be hand and glove with heaven; and no less so to see the whole nation, or at least the whole body of the church folks, or national religionists, (clergy and laity) which constituted the great bulk of the people, giving him full credit for every thing, and deeming the least doubt or hesitation about his miraculous claims as a sure indication of disloyalty, and scarcely short of high treason. Allowing or supposing his majesty to have really possessed this miraculous power, or supernatural healing gift, still it must appear rather a queer case that it should be affected by the *temperature of the seasons*, and actually controlled, overpowered and crippled, as it were, by the *hot weather;* and that the royal operator, in the meantime, in case he persisted in his benevolent practice, or labour of love, during the dog-days, and for sometime before and after, should be exposed to the imminent danger of some alarming *contagion;* at least, he and his courtiers seemed evidently to have had such apprehension. In all this, however, his loyal and admiring subjects could discover nothing, either marvellous or suspicious, or yet any way inconsistent. Their sovereign's miraculous claims found in them the most ready acquiescence. With some, indeed, especially among the poor persecuted nonconformists, the case was otherwise. They disbelieved those royal pretensions. But it only served to strengthen the public prejudice against them; being generally looked upon as an additional and sure proof of their disaffection, or their moral and political depravity.—So much for Charles's supernatural powers and miraculous deeds.

(To be concluded in our next.)

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. Belsham's Reply to "*Another Daventry Pupil.*" (*p.* 26.)

Essex House, February 1, 1813.

Sir,

When gentlemen, and especially those whom I have the pleasure to call my friends, think proper to honour my works with their animadversions, I feel myself reduced to an unpleasant dilemma. If I am silent, I am supposed to concede the justice of the charge, or to treat the writer with a contempt which I never mean to do, except where pretended criticism is evidently the coarse vehicle of unprovoked rancour and malignity. But if I reply, I constantly, and unfortunately, however unintentionally, give offence. Little did I suspect that my late strictures upon the first letter of the "Old Daventry Pupil," would have proved so great an annoyance to the feelings of my worthy friend himself, or to those of his friend, the other Daventry Pupil, who has drawn his pen in his defence. I did not begin my letter with charging my old friend with the want either of Christian "candour and humility," or of common "good manners;" I introduced no sarcastic reflection, either upon his deviation from, or his adherence to, the principles of his education, nor upon his zeal for, or his indifference about, the promulgation of what he believes to be Christian truth. I brought no injurious and unproved charge of "gross reflection" upon the characters of eminently pious and useful men; nor did I, after having thus schooled my worthy friend, and after having exhibited a beautiful specimen of the spirit in which controversy ought to be conducted, conclude my epistle, with gravely lamenting the interruption given to "free, good-humoured correspondence," and with a threat, that if my worthy friend did not submit to discipline with more humility and a better temper, I should have a worse opinion, both of his principles and his party than I had before. All this, Sir, may be very proper in its place; very consistent with good humour, good manners, Christian candour, and Christian humility; and I have no doubt that gentlemen who write in this style are perfectly convinced of the meekness of their spirit and the justice of their rebukes. How far it would be thought seemly for Unitarians, who are expected, poor patient creatures! to bear all and to retaliate nothing, to use such language as this, I stay not to inquire: I only assert that this was not the language nor the spirit of my reply to my old friend the Old Pupil. My only intention was, in the first place, to resist the charge of misstating even an immaterial fact, and, in the second place, to rally my worthy friend, upon his making a serious business of a trifle, and likewise, upon his imputing to the author words which he never wrote, and then launching out into a confutation of his own error, as though it had been the error of the author. I also warned him against the introduction of names and the revival of old feuds, in which I will not, even now, follow the example either of my friend, or of my friend's advocate. Now, Sir, in all this I am not conscious that I felt the slightest degree of irritation, or expressed myself with any unbecoming asperity of language. Much less could I suspect that I had laid myself open to the charge, not only of a violation of Christian humility, which I well know that our *moderate* friends do not regard as our most shining virtue, but even of common good manners, which some of us are allowed to possess;—and that by this one slip, I had even tarnished the reputation of a long life. But I believe, Sir, that the fact is, that we dealers in controversy do not always know what manner of spirit we are of. And of one thing I am certain, from long and large experience, that our language, however guarded, is liable to be misunderstood, and our intentions, however upright, to be misjudged. Could I have thought it possible, Mr. Editor, that what was meant as innocent pleasantry, would have been so galling to the feelings of my worthy friend and of his partizans, I would certainly have abstained from it altogether, and would have been as tame, as solemn and as dull, as any of your gentlest readers could desire. But though I am willing to give up raillery, I must not sacrifice truth even in trifles. My assertion was, that Dr. Doddridge's congregation did not chuse as his successor the minister whom he recommended, but another who had a higher reputation for orthodoxy than the Dr. himself. This information and much more, I received from contemporary witnesses, some of whom were actually present at the church-meeting, when the election took place, and who related to me what passed upon the occasion. It is now sixty-two years last November, since Dr. Doddridge died. And my worthy friends, however venerable or respectable at present, were at that time only ten or fifteen years of age: and they must excuse me, if I prefer the testimony of eye and ear witnesses, to their juvenile opinions and puerile recollections. As to what happened ten years afterwards this deponent sayeth nothing.

---

* See the *Athenæum*, No. 4, p. 360.

I now, Sir, take leave of this *momentous* controversy, and if my worthy friends chuse to write any more upon the subject, they are welcome to keep possession of the field and to exult in their victory. As to myself, though

> "Peace is my dear delight, not Fleury's more,"

yet I find, like other and greater men, that the weapons of war, when once taken up, cannot be laid down at pleasure. Yet still, a foreign war is better than a civil one. And I, with less reluctance, gird on the harness, to encounter the fierce attack of the son of the late Bishop Horsley, who is in great wrath at the review which I have exhibited of his father's controversy with Dr. Priestley, in an Appendix to the Calm Inquiry. But though he advances to the combat with all the insolence of a "giant refreshed with wine," I feel great confidence, that if you will indulge me with a few pages, in three or four of your succeeding Repositories, this vaunting Goliah, who sets at defiance the armies of Israel, shall be laid prostrate before the ark, with a sling and a stone, though hurled by an obscure and a feeble hand.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
THOMAS BELSHAM.

Spiritual Supremacy of Jesus Christ; being part of an Address to a Christian Church, in Answer to the Question, "What is it to be a Christian?"

What is it to be a Christian?—"What is it?" replies the conscience of a wicked man,—"It is to be the reverse of me." "What is it?" says the heart of a good man, "It is to be what I wish to be, but what I fear I am not sufficiently." "What is it?" asks the understanding of every thinking man, "It is to be what no man can be, by the accident of birth, by inheritance, or by fortune, or without personal reflection and individual exertion."

The Christian takes his name from Jesus Christ, who is his chief and leader. He has but this one master; and his first duty, and the first criterion of his character, is obedience to his Lord. There is no other name set forth by Heaven, to influence our faith and worship and manners. The authority of Jesus is pre-eminent; he is head over all things to the church.

The Christian's obedience to Christ, is not of the nature of Divine worship; on the contrary, it is an act of Christian duty, enjoined by Jesus on all his disciples, to worship God the Father, and him only. Respect to Christ is virtually reverence of God who sent him, and who when he, by a miraculous voice, proclaimed him his Well-beloved Son, commanded all the world to hear him.

It is required of us, as Christians, to receive Christ in the sense in which he lays claim to our regards, that is, (among other respects,) as a spiritual *legislator*, the only one competent to make laws in the Church, which shall be binding on the conscience. He claimed this authority, and God sanctioned his claim; but he delegated it to no one else; he has had, properly speaking, no successor. That, therefore, which he established must be left untouched till the times of reformation, when he shall come with still larger powers than before, and new model and improve even his own economy: that which he ordained not, cannot be imposed by authority on any of his followers. Christians are, as individuals, to exercise their independent judgment upon every religious subject that falls under their cognizance, and Christian societies must, in a great number of cases, regulate their proceedings by their own discretion; but this is a main Christian principle, the pillar of truth, never to be weakened or undermined, that no man or body of men has any right to impose articles of faith or terms of communion upon his or their brethren, which the head of the church has not enacted,—or even to enforce any that he has clearly enacted, by any other mode than argument and persuasion. No man or church is to be condemned for any tenet conscientiously held; but the moment such man or church attempts to urge that tenet upon me, contrary to my convictions, there is an invasion of my rights, an usurpation of the lordship of Jesus, and it becomes my imperious duty, to resist the attack with Christian weapons, and to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made me free.

Here is the true ground of our dissent from the Church of England and all national churches, antecedently to all inquiry into their doctrines. It matters not whether they mean to establish truth or error; they are, in themselves, radically vicious; they make claims which Christ has never sanctioned, which he has forbidden, and to which no Christian ought to submit. They connect the church with the state, which our Lord has declared separate, in that good confession before Pontius Pilate, which ought to be inscribed on our churches, engraved, as with the pen of a diamond, on a rock for ever;—*My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight; but now is my kingdom not from hence.* They make the magistrate or the legislature the judge of truth, which is independent of them, and cannot be helped or hindered by their decisions. They are connected with formal articles of faith, whereas none such were laid down by our Lord, who has left it the glory of Christianity, that it is not reduced to a creed:—it is the religion of a few plain facts, depending on evidence, requiring no learning to make them clear and no worldly power to enforce them; he that studies them will understand them, and he that believes them and enters into their practical import, is, without and in spite of opulent establishments and officious civil powers, a genuine Christian. They must, once more, be supported and guarded by penal statutes, for I speak the experience of 1500 years, when I say that it is essential to the existence of an hierarchy, to have rewards for right believing and punishments for wrong, immunities and privileges for orthodoxy, disqualifications and disgrace for heresy. But how does this system of things agree with the genius of Christianity, the spirit of Jesus? He, in the days of his flesh, judged and punished no man for his faith or his want of it; but his daring followers have adjudged themselves wiser and more powerful than he, and have usurped an office, that of determining on men's minds and hearts, which he left to his Father.

I shall confine this address to this one point, because it appears to me that the very first principle of a Christian character is the acknowledgment of no authority but Christ's, under God, in matters of religion, and because this all-important principle is from ignorance or from conformity to the world, too little brought forward by those whose religious profession cannot be vindicated without it. It is true that as worshippers of one God, the Father, only, we should have a good ground of dissent from a Trinitarian established church, if divine authority could be produced for the alliance between church and state; but there being no such authority to be shewn, the first error of an hierarchy, the error of errors, is its being an hierarchy. Its constitution is of little moment; the building itself stands upon stolen ground. No room could have been gained for it, but by direct and grievous encroachment; and therefore, whether the erection be Athanasian or Unitarian in its form, I would equally plead that, according to the declared mind and will of the only Lord of conscience, it ought not to have been set up, but ought, on the contrary, to be taken down with as much haste as is compatible with the safety of those employed in its demolition.

I confess, my brethren, I have not that (as I conceive, misnamed,) candour, which would hold parley with error, and enter into compromise with spiritual wickedness in high places. I would aim to be a faithful subject of the Prince of Life and Lord of Glory, and while I would yield to none in obedience to Cæsar, within his own jurisdiction, I would be the first to denounce and oppose him, when he steps out of it, and invades the province of "another king, one Jesus."

To be a Christian is then, in a word, to call Jesus Lord; to renounce all other authority in religion; and to maintain the interests of his spiritual kingdom. He has given us truth in trust, saying "Occupy till I come;" and miserable will be our feelings and wretched our fate, if in giving an account of our stewardship, we have to say, "We bartered away the jewel for the phantom reputation, or the thick clay of worldly gain:" or, "We surrendered it up to a worm, lifting its head to power and state." A.

Reflections on a Death-bed.

March 28, 1812.

Sir,

Before I reached my 20th year, I happened to read a celebrated French novel, which is, by the generality of parents, and perhaps with reason, judged unfit and dangerous for the perusal of youth. There is, however, one passage in it with which I was so much delighted, that I wrote it out, and keeping the paper in my pocket-book, read it over and over with undiminished pleasure, through a course of years. Some time ago, I had a dangerous illness, and at a time when I believed my life drawing near its close, I wished again to hear it read, and as it even then seemed equally just and interesting, it appears, as far as my judgment goes, to have a value which justifies my offering it to your readers; many of whom may have neither the wish or opportunity of perusing the work from which it is taken. The heroine of the piece is on her death-bed, and a minister attending her, she thus addresses him:—

"I have lived and I die in the Protestant communion, whose maxims are deduced from scripture and reason; concerning which my heart hath always confirmed what my lips have uttered; and though I may not always have had that docility in regard to your precepts, which perhaps I ought, it has arisen from my aversion to all kind of hypocrisy: that which I could not believe, I never could profess; I have always sincerely sought what was most conformable to truth and the glory of my Creator. I may have been deceived in my research; not having the vanity to think I have been always in the right. I may, indeed, have been constantly in the wrong; but my intention has been invariably good. This was as much as was in my own power. If God did not vouchsafe to enlighten my understanding farther, he is too merciful and just to demand of me an account of what he has not committed to my care.

"This, Sir, is all I think necessary to say on the opinions I profess. As to the rest, let my present situation answer for me. With my head distracted by illness, and subjected to the delirium of a fever, is it now a proper time to endeavour to reason better than I did in health, when my understanding was unimpaired and as sound as I received it from my Maker?—If I was deceived then, am I less liable to be so now? and in my present weakness does it depend on me to believe otherwise than I did when in full health and strength of body and mind? It is our reason which determines our belief, but mine has lost its best faculties; what dependance then could be made on the opinions I should now adopt without it? What now remains for me to do, is to appeal to what I believed before; for the uprightness of my intention is the same, though I have lost my judgment. If I am in an error, I am sorry for and detest it; and this is sufficient to set my heart at ease as to my belief.

"With respect to my preparation for death, that, Sir, is made; badly, indeed, I own, but it is done in the best manner I could; and at least much better than I can do it now. I endeavoured to discharge that important part of my duty before I became incapable of it. I prayed in health—when I was strong I struggled with divine grace for favour; at present, now I am weak, I am resigned and rely upon it. The best prayers of the sick are patience and resignation. The preparation for death is a good life, I know of no other. While I conversed with you, while I meditated by myself, while I endeavoured to discharge the duties which providence ordained for me; it was then that I was preparing for death, for meeting my God and judge at my last hour. It was then I adored him with all my faculties and powers: what more can I now do, when I have lost them? Is my languid soul in a condition to raise itself to the Almighty? this remnant of a half extinguished life, absorbed in pain, is it worthy of being offered up to God?—no Sir, he leaves it me to employ it for those he taught me to love, and from whom it is his sovereign will that I should now depart; I am going to leave them to go to him; it is, therefore, with them I should now concern myself; I shall soon have nothing to do but with him alone: the last pleasure I take on earth shall be in doing my last duty; is not that to serve him and to do his will; to discharge all those duties which humanity enjoins me, before I throw it off entirely? What have I to do to calm troubles which I have not? my conscience is not troubled: if sometimes it has accused me, it has done it more when I was in health than at present. It tells me now that God is more merciful than I am criminal; and my confidence increases as I find my approach nearer to him. I do not present him with an imperfect, tardy or forced repentance, which, dictated by fear, can never be truly sincere, and is only a snare by which the false penitent is deceived. I do not present him with the service of the remnant and latter end of my days, full of pain and sorrow, a prey to sickness, grief, anxiety, death; and which I would not dedicate to his service, till I could do nothing else. No, I present before him my whole life, full, indeed, of errors and faults, but exempt from the remorse of the impious and the crimes of the wicked.

"To what punishment can a just God condemn me? The reprobate, it is said, hate him. Must he not first make me not love him? No, I fear not to be found one of that number. O, thou great eternal Being! Supreme Intelligence! Source of life and happiness! Creator! Preserver! Father! Lord of nature! God, powerful and good, of whose existence I never doubted for a moment, and under whose eye I have ever delighted to live! I know, I rejoice that I am going to appear before thy throne. In a few days my soul, delivered from its earthly tabernacle, shall begin to pay thee, more worthily, that homage which will constitute my happiness to all eternity. I look upon what I shall be till that moment comes, as nothing. My body, indeed, still lives; but my intellectual life is at an end. I am at the end of my career, and am already judged from what is past.

To suffer, to die, is all that I have now to do: and this is nature's work. I have endeavoured to live in such a manner as to have no occasion to concern myself at death, and now it approaches, I see it without fear. Those who sleep in the bosom of a Father, are in no fear of being awaked."

M. H.

A Dialogue on our Obligation to study the Scriptures, and to act on the Motives which they prescribe, even though their Divine Origin should be uncertain.

A.—You tell me that you find yourself able to avoid all gross offences, all sensual indulgences, all sorts of debauchery, and, you believe, every instance of cruelty and injustice; that you perform as many acts of benevolence as you think consistent with your circumstances; in short, that you act up to all the obligations of morality, and that your conscience does not reproach you with any crimes performed, nor with any duties omitted. You profess yourself satisfied with such conduct, and not only with your conduct, (which is, indeed, more free from vice than that of almost any body I know,) but also with the motive that gives birth to it, though you confess that you are living in great ignorance of the scriptures, and do not *pretend* to any *higher* incitement to good, nor think any *higher* motive necessary to your salvation than the wish of promoting the welfare of your fellow men. You say, what could I better, if I acted on scripture motives? If I found myself unable to abstain from the commission of evil, or indisposed to do good, I would then seek for some new motive of action;—I would then search the scriptures? But so long as I feel no such deficiency in myself, I cannot see the necessity for better principles than those I possess. What tie is there on me to search the scriptures? To do so may be a dangerous experiment. It may stagger me in my present way of thinking, without giving me any power of adopting a better. It may deprive me of the satisfaction I at present feel, whilst it *cannot* inspire me with a more *perfect* self-complacency. What can I do better than well? What assurance of doing well can I have stronger than the self-satisfaction I now feel? God has implanted conscience in our breasts, as a sure guide to right conduct; a certain, and never-failing test, by which to estimate our actions justly. By that test I have examined mine; and I repeat that it decides in my favour. What can I wish for more? What surer evidence can I have of my own safety?*

Such is the language which you hold to me, and the substance of it is, "What tie is there on me to study the scriptures?" This I will answer, by enquiring what is the crime of not doing it?

Suppose that some time after the death of a very dear friend, your instructor and guide, whom you had loved for his virtues and reverenced for his wisdom, there should appear in the world a book, which was reported to be the production of his pen. Suppose that the greater part of the world should have agreed to attribute it to him; that a very *great* proportion of the best and wisest men you know, should declare the evidence in favour of his having written it, to be very strong and convincing. Suppose that you could scarcely mix in any society where serious subjects were discussed, without hearing this book referred to, as one of uncommon excellence and the composition of your former intimate. Should you not think yourself the most unreasonable of all beings, if, without examining into the testimony which declared against such an opinion, you decided that the book in question was *not* the production of your friend. But this injustice you are guilty of towards God, if you declare your disbelief of the divine origin of the scriptures, without having examined into the evidence which is brought forward to *prove* their origin divine. This, however, is a piece of blind injustice that I trust you are not so irrational as to be guilty of. To come more immediately to your own case:—Should you not think that you paid the memory of your deceased friend a very ill compliment, if you gave yourself no trouble to ascertain, whether this so much talked of book was really his production? If you neglected to examine into either the evidence that offered itself to you from without, or its *internal* evidence of genuineness? Yet this insult do you offer to God if you neglect to examine all the proofs that can be adduced of the truth of holy writ.

---

* The reader will see in this language something of the spirit of Hume.

Further, after having been persuaded to investigate the evidence, and having convinced yourself that the book in question did indeed come from the hand of your lamented instructor, should you not be most anxious to drink deep of his doctrines; to instruct yourself in his sentiments; to conform to the advice, and catch the spirit of the man, whose opinion you had been accustomed so much to reverence? Should you not confidently presume that the instructions of that man whom you had known to be so good and so wise, must be wholesome and profitable? Should you not think it almost criminal, if, with such means of improvement in your reach, you neglected to seize them? Yet this criminal neglect you are guilty of towards God, your best and kindest friend, when, believing that the scriptures are his word, you neglect to study them.

B.—As to the genuineness or authenticity of the scriptures, I am not disposed to dispute about them. If they are true, I think that they were written for the use of such only as feel the want of them; such as cannot curb their passions without them. I, whether constitutionally without strong passions, or from any other cause, feel no such want. I have therefore, no stimulus to enquire into the force of those proofs which you so often press upon me. The scriptures may or may not be true, I have never yet taken the trouble seriously to scrutinize them, nor—

A.—There let me stop you. By confessing that the scriptures *may* be true, you condemn yourself as a rational being. If the scriptures *may* be true, then you *may* (as if they are true you certainly will) be condemned for not acting in all you do from that motive, which they prescribe as the only one that will be accepted; the only one by which any deed can be sanctified, or find favour in the eyes of our Maker. If you would take the trouble to *read* the scriptures, you would find them declaring throughout, the absolute necessity of acting from this motive, which is the desire of pleasing God in every thing that we undertake. And it is nothing to call in question the justice of God's requiring such motive from us: he had a right to prescribe to men what terms he pleased, and it is not for us to object to them, unless we think fit to set our own wisdom against omniscience; and even though we were disposed so to do, still, unless we were also able to set our power against that of the Almighty, unless we could overcome omnipotence, we shall find our only safety in obedience.*

From what I have said, then, it is obvious that you *may* incur some danger by neglecting the scriptures—a danger no less than the possibility of incurring eternal punishment. Now, by making them the rule of your life, you at least run no sort of risk; if they do no good, they can do no harm. If, as to man, all things end with this life; or if a strict compliance with scriptural injunctions will give us no claim to future reward; if we are to enjoy eternal bliss without such compliance; or if we are never to enjoy it at all;—still, in any case, you will not be the *worse off*, for having been guided by the gospel. Nobody will say, that it is *bad*, or *dangerous*, and that obedience to it will render us fit objects of *punishment*. But if that word be true which declares that they shall incur eternal misery who act not according to its spirit and decrees, or who act agreeably to those decrees from any other than the motive prescribed, viz. the desire of obeying God; if, I say, this be the real state of the case, do but consider for a moment what he will draw upon himself who has dared to neglect the scripture terms of salvation. Think how irrationally and improvidently he acts, who chooses rather to go on in a course of life which may or may not be punished with the greatest conceivable misery, than to live in that state in which he is certainly safe! How would such conduct be condemned in worldly matters! How much would a minister (however well meaning) be censured for his stupidity, who, when he might adopt such measures as would *infallibly* defend his country from the attacks of its enemy, should yet resort to those which left its safety uncertain. You say, that you are satisfied with yourself and that you cannot acknowledge the necessity of any better motive to action than that which influences you. But if you acknowledge that the scriptures *may* be true, and also grant (which you must do, if you examine them) that those scriptures make the wish to serve God, the only saving motive of our conduct; you must then allow, that, by acting from any *other* motive, you *may* incur eternal punishment.

And with respect to conscience, you misrepresent the fact. Conscience is *not* a faculty of itself sufficient to lead us to a *perfect* knowledge of what actions are right and what wrong. Conscience is the testimony of reason deciding for or against us, "accusing or excusing us;" but as our reason is imperfect, so the decision which it gives, i. e. the judgment of conscience must sometimes be wrong. Conscience did not teach the ancients that revenge was a crime; it would not have taught you so, unless your reason be stronger and more perfect than theirs, which you will scarcely affirm it to be. It is true you *do* know and acknowledge that revenge *is* a crime; but *how* do you know it? Through those very scriptures which you yet think not of the first moment. By no other means, through no other channel, could the discovery be made; there is no other moral or religious code which holds the same doctrine.

---

* If the case were otherwise than as it is,—if we were to be rewarded or punished as our *constitutional* propensities to moral good or evil differ, then indeed, we might, with some shew of reason, call in question the justice of God.

It appears then, my dear friend, that we require some better guide than mere reason or conscience, and we know that the best and wisest men have, for many ages, agreed to acknowledge the scriptures as this guide; let us then ask ourselves, if it be not the height of pride and self-sufficiency to reject, without the strictest examination, or even to neglect, that which so many better and wiser men have believed and acted on. Let us not venture to sit down satisfied with any other motives than those which the gospel exacts, till we have convinced ourselves, by the most irrefragable arguments, and the most indubitable proofs, that we are safe in so doing. Otherwise we act the part of the stupid minister before mentioned, with this aggravation of the case, that whereas he could but incur for his folly the vengeance of man, and that for a very short period, we may be exposing ourselves to the wrath of God for all eternity. I will make use of one other argument to shew the injustice that you do, both to yourself and to God, by not studying the scriptures. Let us suppose, that you wished to perfect yourself in mathematics; would you not take some trouble to ascertain the readiest means of so doing? As, for instance, how to find out the best masters, how to possess yourself of the best books, in short, so far as your means went, how to procure every convenience for the ready and certain attainment of your end? Now you must and do, I am sure, think it the most desirable thing in the world, to know and practise the best method of securing the favour and approbation of your Maker: and yet you neglect, entirely neglect, that book which professes to teach the best, nay, the *only* means of gaining an end the most important that you can possibly have in view. And this indifference you manifest, even though the best and wisest men declare their belief, that the said book can do all it professes. You confess, that it behoves all men to serve God acceptably, and yet you neglect those rules of conduct, which, if you were to ask the first man that you meet in the street for a spiritual guide, he would direct you to, as best calculated to answer your end, and written for that very purpose. Thus then you are not half so anxious to promote your eternal welfare, as you would be to perfect yourself in mathematics; nor a hundredth part so much interested in a question which relates to your everlasting happiness or misery, as I have seen you in some political dispute, the subject of which was, the good or bad conduct of this or that ministry. If I were to tell you that you have no love for your country, you would be vastly indignant; but you bear with the utmost composure to hear from me that you have no religion. Is this the part of wisdom? Does it agree with your usual good sense? Is it consistent with your general prudence? Is it of a piece with the justness of your judgment on most occasions? Surely not.

Hume and Mrs. Hannah More.

Sir, *February* 3, 1813.

I agree with *A Constant Reader* (pp. 32, 33) that the fear of being left in solitude and darkness may happen to possess the minds even of the firmest believers in revelation: I further admit, that examples, such as those alleged by the writers on whom he animadverts, should be very cautiously adduced and very temperately applied; and, lastly, I join him in condemning the style and tone in which "many zealots of the present day" speak of the deaths of those of "their fellow creatures" who have not subscribed to the evidences of Christianity. Christianity, doubtless, is ill defended by the reasonings which these men employ and by the spirit which they exercise in its vindication.

Coinciding thus far with your correspondent, I beg permission to point out what I take to be an inaccuracy in the following sentence of his letter:

"A celebrated female writer, in a recent work, has laboured all in her power to convince us, that Hume's was a miserable death-bed."

This *celebrated female writer*, I presume, is the author of *Practical Piety*, the nineteenth chapter of which work has for its title "Happy Deaths," and, after examining as much of it as relates to the subject at issue, I can affirm, that the statement of your "Constant Reader" is inadvertently exaggerated. Mrs. M. does *not* "labour all in her power to convince us, that Hume's was a *miserable* death-bed." She does indeed endeavour to shew (with what success let others judge) that the closing scene of "this eminent historian and philosopher" might not be in truth so happy as is represented by his friend Dr. Adam Smith. But she is far from asserting that it was *wretched.* They are *the dying horrors* of "the sage of Ferney" on which she expatiates: in the case of Mr. Hume, she was unable to discover any thing which resembled them.

A Constant Reader might, with greater justice, have complained of Mrs. M. for her treatment of the author of "The Wealth of Nations."—After strongly censuring what she regards as his *extravagant* eulogium on Hume, she says of this "eloquent panegyrist,"

"With as insidious an innuendo as has ever been thrown out against revealed religion, he goes on to observe, that *perhaps it is one of the very worst circumstances against Christianity, that very few of its professors were ever either so moral, so humane, or could so philosophically govern their passions, as the sceptical David Hume.*"

Now, Sir, although these words

may, I suppose, be found in the earlier editions of Dr. Smith's Letter to the late Mr. Strahan, *they are wanting in the recent impressions of it*;* from which circumstance we may fairly infer, that the writer had judged proper to suppress them, and, consequently, that they should not be used as the materials of a charge against his memory.

There was much to be admired in the *virtues* of Mr. Hume as a man, and in his *talents* as a writer. However, let me not be accused of bigotry, if I venture to suggest, that his character might have been yet more exemplary, his last moments yet happier and more instructive, had he taken the Christianity of the New Testament for the rule of his life and the charter of his hope.

Yours, &c. N.

Cases of Thomas Aikenhead and Paul Best.

Sir, *February* 7, 1813.

I can offer *Bidellianus*, (p. 17.) but little additional information respecting the case of *Aikenhead*. The following is, however, at his service.

I have an 18mo volume, entituled, *Institutions of the Criminal Law of Scotland, for the use of the Students who attend the Lectures of Alexander Bayne, J.P.* [*Juris Professor.*] Edinburgh, 1748.

At page 5, are the following passages, under the title *Blasphemy:*

"According to our written law, the punishment of *blasphemy* is death: and the *first* species thereof consists in the railing upon, or cursing God, that is, uttering imprecations against the *Almighty*, (unless the offender is under the power of madness) without distinction whether he continues in the practice of it or not; for the *single act* constitutes the crime. The *second* consists in the denying the existence of the Supreme Being or any of the persons of the blessed Trinity, and therein persevering obstinately to the last; for reiterated denial does not fully constitute the crime, because the statute admits of repentance before conviction, as a complete expiation. *Act* 21. *Parl.* 1. *Sess.* 1. *Charles II.*

"This *Act*, 1661, is ratified by *Act* 11. *Sess.* 5. *K. William.* And it is farther thereby provided, that none shall, either in discourse or writing, call in question the existence of God or any of the persons of the Trinity, or the authority of the *scriptures*, or the *Divine Providence* in the government of the Universe. And that the punishment of the *first* offence shall be imprisonment, till satisfaction given by public repentance in sackcloth. Of the *second*, a fine of a year's valued rent of the real estate and a twentieth part of the personal estate. The trial of both which is competent to the inferior judges. That the punishment of the *third* offence shall be death, to be tried only by the *justices*. Upon these two Acts we had one noted trial, in the case of *Thomas Aikenhead*, *anno* 1696, who was thereupon convicted and executed." One of your correspondents in Scotland can probably gain access to, and give some account of the *noted trial* here mentioned by the Professor.

---

* Even in the edition of 1782, eight years *before* Dr. Smith's death.

In *England*, the latest instance I have found of persecution unto death, by the *executioner*, (if the punishment were really inflicted,) occurred in 1645, to the indelible disgrace of the *Long Parliament*. I quote the following passage from their own historian and one of their most eminent members, *Whitelock*. Mem. (Ed. 1732.) P. 190.

"1645, Jan. 28, The day of the monthly fast. In the evening the house met, and heard a report from the Committee of Plundered Ministers, of the blasphemies of one *Paul Best*, *who denied the Trinity of the Godhead, and the Deity of Christ and the Holy Ghost*. The House ordered him to be kept close prisoner, *and an Ordinance to be brought in*, *to punish him with death*." To these *new forcers of conscience*, who could thus prepare themselves by a *fast*, not to *let the oppressed go free*, but to *smite with the fist of wickedness*, Milton might well say,

Because you have thrown off your prelate lord
And with stiff vows renounc'd his Liturgy,
Dare ye, for this, adjure the civil sword
To force our consciences, that Christ set free.

I know not any instance of juridical enormity which exceeds, and very few which equal, this design, to destroy a prisoner by an *ex post facto* law. Yet I doubt whether this *Ordinance* were really passed; for I find *the Assembly of Divines*, in their sanguinary attempt against *Biddle*, obliged to "solicite the Parliament, and procure a Draconic Ordinance (May 2, 1648), for inflicting the punishment of death upon those that held opinions contrary to the Presbyterian points, about the Trinity and other doctrines, whom they named blasphemers and hereticks." Thus writes the author of *A short Account of the Life of John Biddle, M. A. sometimes of Magdalene Hall, Oxon.* (P. 5, in Unit. Tracts, 4to. 1691.) I shall be much obliged to any of your readers, who will communicate, or refer me to, a further account of *Paul Best* and the story of his persecution.

R.

Quaker Doctrine of the Trinity.

SIR,

As you have lately given your readers a very interesting account of the expulsion of a worthy member of the Society of "Friends" (no longer it seems, as they were formerly thought, to liberty and free enquiry), for questioning the doctrine of the Trinity, it may not, perhaps, be unacceptable to many of your readers to learn, from the following document, what sort of a Trinity it is, which at least some highly accredited members of this Society profess to believe. I was furnished with it by a Friend who had questioned my right to consider myself a Christian, because I was understood not to believe in the Divinity of Christ; and to whom I had answered, that, if by Divinity was meant "Divine commission and authority," I believed it as firmly as any person: — but, that if this term meant "essential Deity, equality with the Father," I certainly did not believe it, nor could I conceive that any person could prove such a doctrine from the scriptures. My friend declined entering into any explanations, observing that it was not the practice of their Society to engage in theological controversy; but requested some short and simple exposition of my general notions; expressing, at the same time, no great reluctance to give the Quaker-creed in return. Accordingly, I sent Dr. Priestley's Appeal, with Elwall's Trial appended to it; which last I thought would be likely to be read by him with particular interest on account of the author's partial connection with the Society of Friends. In return I received the following paper:—

"*On the Unity of the Godhead, under the different Appellations of Father, Son and Holy Spirit.*

"The Father, Son and Holy Spirit are not three distinct persons or essences, but essentially and identically one and the same, each signifying the one true God, and not collectively implying a composition or aggregate, in the essentiality of the Divinity. For he is a pure, simple, perfect Being, independently supreme, without parts and without mixture, incapable of addition or diminution, having in himself inherently and incomprehensibly all possible perfection.

"The different appellations of Father, Son and Holy Spirit are, nevertheless, not to be used indifferently or indiscriminately one for another, because they are properly and consistently used only, as this one supreme, self-existing essence is considered in different points of view.

"For when considered as the great First Cause of all things, from whence the whole universe of animate and inanimate creation solely derives its origin and existence, he is very expressively and significantly called the Father.

"When he is considered as acting in and actuating his creatures, and administering unto them such suitable helps as their situations in the scale of existence requires, more especially in this spiritual and substantial dispensation, he is then with equal propriety termed the Son.

"Again, as he measurably acts in the hearts of men individually, in reproving and correcting them for every impurity of action and intention, in manifesting in them, with convincing, self-evident and undeniable clearness, the path that leads to eternal blessedness with himself; and in enabling them, by the influence of mercy, love and strength, to walk and persevere steadily therein, during this scene of mutability and change, he is justly denominated the Spirit, with the emphatical epithet of Holy."

Whether this is an extract from some authorized Quaker-creed, or from the works of some approved writer of that respectable Christian sect, or whether it is an original production, I know not. If either of the former, perhaps some of your correspondents can point it out. But it was surely a needless exertion of inquisitorial power, first to catechise, and then to expel, an eminent and long-valued member of their body, for impugning the Trinitarian doctrine, if they had no better form of it to uphold than this.—It is, at best, a mere *modal* Trinity, explicitly disavowing the idea of "three distinct Persons or Essences;" in short, it is like all the modifications of what is usually called the Sabellian scheme, supplying a pretence for the use of orthodox language, while the real doctrine is strictly Unitarian. But, in fact, it is not even modally Trinitarianism, but Dualism; with this difference from the Dualism of the immediate successor of the "apostate" Robinson, (as his successor in the second degree,* it seems, makes no scruple to call him), that, whereas, the Hallian creed is understood to discard the Spirit, this creed appears to discard the Son; and if it can be called a Trinity at all, it is composed of the Father and two Spirits; not a word is used under the second head, that can be supposed to have the remotest reference to the history, doctrine, death or resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ.

But to leave this, will you permit me, Mr. Editor, to take the opportunity which the above related incident affords me, of expressing my regret that the Antitrinitarians should have been so ready to join issue with their opponents as to admit that they "deny the Divinity of Christ." Divinity is a scholastic term, well understood by thorough-paced theologians; but, by the bulk of English readers, its denial is, I believe, very generally considered as a denial of the divine commission and authority of Christ. Many times have I been obliged to remove this stumbling-block from the threshold of the excellent tract of Dr. Priestley's, referred to above, when first put into the hands of persons in other respects not indisposed to admit the Unitarian doctrine; and if I were a member of the Committee of the London Book Society, I should be strongly tempted to move tha the word "Deity" should be substituted for "Divinity," in the title-page of the next edition.

I am, &c.

N. C.

Sketch of English Protestant Persecution.—Letter VI.

Sir, *Jan.* 3, 1813.

I am disposed, by your permission, to bring down nearer to our times the *Sketch of English Protestant Persecution*, begun in your last volume [pp. 38, 218, 301, 362, 436]. To this attempt I am more inclined by observing, with regret, the zeal with which Protestants are now encouraging each other, under the pretence of maintaining a Protestant ascendancy, to perpetuate Protestant persecution; not, indeed, the persecution of the stake or the dungeon, but the milder vexation of disfranchisement and disability.

My last letter ended with the reign of Edward the Sixth. I should now proceed to notice the spirit of Protestant persecution, discovered by Elizabeth and those who participated in civil power during her reign. But I have previously a debt of justice to discharge, towards the memory of a foreign scholar and divine, in his age, almost singularly enlightened on the subject of religious liberty, and whose sentiments as peculiarly applicable to the persecution under Edward the Sixth, should have been quoted in a former letter, had I been then aware of them. The person I mean is *Sebastian Castellio.* Looking, very lately, into his Latin version of the Bible, I observed that he had addressed the work to Edward the Sixth, in a prefatory dedication. This was dated from *Basil, February,* 1551.

---

* See Apostacy, a Sermon, by F. A. Cox, M. A.

He begins by detailing the arguments which his friends had urged, for dedicating his version to the king:—that his kingdom had been an asylum to the persecuted for the study of the scriptures: that the king himself had promoted a version of the scriptures, a design interrupted by the death of a scholar (not named):—that Edward, besides other literature, had peculiarly cultivated the *Latin* tongue, under a most learned tutor.

Castellio, after describing the design of his version, and the principle and conduct of his translation, proceeds to consider the religious dissentions of his time. These he resolves into an ignorance of divine truth, which he attributes to an irreligious spirit. After a long and highly appropriate enumeration of prophetic scriptures, describing the peace and virtue of gospel times, he inquires if these predictions have been yet accomplished. Proceeding to his own time, he sarcastically *admires* that peace which forms swords out of scythes and ploughshares, and converts houses and their utensils into guns and bulwarks.—He then thus laments the rancour displayed by rival polemics, and the frequency of religious persecution, by the aid of the civil power, designing, as I suppose, especially to condemn *Protestant* persecution, by his frequent repetition of the phrase *studio Christi :*—

"Perhaps this peace abides with the learned masters of the people. Whence then the strife of tongues and pens, more pernicious than that of the sword? Whence the grievous controversies which cannot be decided even in these disputatious times, and generally end in the destruction of the weaker party, while there is no one who is diffident of his own opinion, or who hesitates to condemn the opinion of another. We envy, we calumniate, we not only retaliate evils, but often return evil for good. If any one differ from us, though on some inconsiderable article of faith, we anathematise him and pursue him into every corner of the land, with the hostility of the tongue and the pen. We persecute with fire, water and the sword, and thus hurry out of the world, the destitute and defenceless. We declare it unlawful for *us* to kill. We, therefore, deliver to Pilate, and if he dismiss his prisoner, we say he is not Cæsar's friend. But what is most abominable, we profess to act thus by the example and command, and in the name of Christ. Thus we conceal under the skin of a lamb, the ferocity of the wolf. O what times! Do we become sanguinary by the example of Christ, who, that the blood of others should not be shed, poured out his own? Do we extirpate the tares by the example of Christ, who, lest the wheat should be destroyed, commanded, that the tares should remain to the harvest? Do we persecute by the example of Christ, who commanded, if any one smite us on the right side, to turn to him the left? Do we injure others by the example of Christ, who commanded us to return good for evil?"

After inquiring where was to be found the *charity* celebrated by Paul, referring the king to examples of Judas Machabæus and Moses, and warning him in the words of *Gamaliel* and of Paul, concerning *him that is weak in the faith*. Castellio thus returns to a subject he had before treated:—"Let us obey the righteous judge, and leave the tares till the harvest, lest, while we would be wiser than the master, we destroy the wheat." He happily adds,—"Neither is this the end of the world, nor are we the angels to whom that province is committed." He then enlarges on the absurdity of waging a spiritual warfare with the weapons of this world. Having described that warfare, he proceeds to make a very just distinction between the obvious and highly important duties of a magistrate, and his affected *cure of souls*.

Having stated the inconsistency of mixing in society with Turks and Jews, and men of all characters, and, at the same time, prosecuting virtuous, if differing, Christians, Castellio enlarges on the civil impolicy of persecution. He then closes, with the best wishes for the young king, of whom he professes, though he has addressed him in such terms, to have heard nothing amiss. He evidently regarded Edward, now in his 14th year, as not in the exercise of government, but in a condition of pupillage, *sub tutorum cura*. It is remarkable that he makes no reference, throughout this Dedication, to the then governors of church and state, in this country. He must have heard of the sufferings of Joan Bocher, and of the spirit betrayed by Cranmer and his associates. To counteract that spirit, in the mind of the young king, was, I apprehend, the chief design of this Dedication. We have seen (vol. vii. p. 436, 437) Calvin recommending persecution unto death to Edward's governors. The Reformer of Geneva could not fail to hate Castellio, *with perfect hatred*. His forbearance and his faith must have been equally offensive. According to Dr. Chandler, in his *History of Persecution*, (p. 312, in *Memoirs of Socinus*, p. 74) Calvin addressed Castellio with these harsh greetings,—"Blasphemer, reviler, malicious barking dog, full of ignorance, bestiality and impudence, impostor, a base corrupter of the sacred writings, a mocker of God, a contemner of all religion, an impudent fellow, a filthy dog, a knave, an impudent, lewd, crooked-minded vagabond, beggerly rogue, a disciple and brother of Servetus, and an Heretic." Dr. Chandler adds, "Castellio's reply to all these flowers is worthy the patience and moderation of a Christian, and from his slanderer he appeals to the righteous judgment of God."

In the next letter, I shall attempt to ascertain the character of Elizabeth's reign, as it respects the subject of this *Sketch*. That princess will, I believe, be found to deserve a higher station than historians have generally assigned her, among Protestant persecutors.

R. G. S.

A Quere.

SIR,

The reduced, fast-decaying sect of old Thirty-nine, or, at least a plurality of its remaining members, (ridiculously enough, indeed, but in spite, it is to be feared, rather than mistake,) persist in calling us by the name of *Socinians*. What would their poor Rump aggregate think and say of us, were we in return to designate them by the far more characteristic appellation of *Cranmerites?*

TE TACE.

JOHN MILTON.

Unus Patronus bonæ causæ satis est.
EPISCOPIUS.

No. XV.

Civil and Ecclesiastical Functions.

Then both commonwealth and religion will, at length, if ever, flourish in Christendom, when either they who govern discern between civil and religious, or they only who so discern shall be admitted to govern*.

No. XVI.

Female Society.

No mortal nature can endure, either in the actions of religion or study of wisdom, without sometime slackening the cords of intense thought and labour: which lest we should think faulty, God himself conceals us not his own recreations before the world was built; I *was*, saith the eternal Wisdom, *daily his delight, playing always before him.* And to him, indeed, wisdom is as a high tower of pleasure, but to us a steep hill, and we toyling ever about the bottom: he executes with ease the exploits of his omnipotence, as easie as with us it is to will:—but no worthy enterprise can be done by us, without continual plodding and wearisomenes to our faint and sensitive abilities. We cannot, therefore, always be contemplative or pragmatical abroad, but have need of some delightful intermissions, wherein the enlarged soul may leave off a while her severe schooling; and like a glad youth in wandering vacancy, may keep her hollidaies to joy and harmless pastime: which as she cannot well do without company, so in no company so well as where the different sex, in most resembling unlikeness, and most unlike resemblance, cannot but please best, and be pleased in the aptitude of that variety.

No. XVII.

The Fathers.

Whatsoever time, or the heedless hand of blind chance, hath drawn down from of old to this present, in her huge drag-net, whether fish or sea-weed, shells or shrubbs, unpickt, unchosen, those are the Fathers.

No. XVIII.

Form of Prayer.

What if it be granted to the infirmity of some ministers, (though such seem to be rather half-ministers) to help themselves with a set form, shall it therefore be urged upon the plenteous graces of others? And let it be granted to some people, while they are babes in Christian gifts, were it not better to take it away soon after, as we do loitering books and *interlineary* translations from children?

---

* The same thought is thus expressed in the Sonnet to Sir H. Vane:

"Both spiritual pow'r and civil, what each means,
"What severs each, thou well hast learn'd, which few have done."

No. XIX.

Happiness of a People.

He [Cha. I.] would work the people to a persuasion, that if he be miserable they cannot be happy. What should hinder them? Were they all born twins of Hippocrates with him and his fortune, one birth, one burial? It were a nation miserable indeed, not worth the name of a nation, but a race of ideots, whose happiness and welfare depended upon one man. The happiness of a nation consists in true religion, piety, justice, prudence, temperance, fortitude, and in the contempt of avarice and ambition. They, in whomsoever these virtues dwell eminently, need not kings to make them happy, but are the architects of their own happiness; and whether to themselves or others, are not less than kings.

No. XX.

Heretic.

He who to his best apprehension follows the scripture, though against any point of doctrine, by the whole church received, is not the heretic; but he who follows the church against his conscience and persuasion, grounded on the scripture.

He is the only heretic who counts all heretics but himself.

No. XXI.

Irregularity.

That is not always best which is most regular to written law. Great worthies heretofore, by disobeying law, oft-times have saved the commonwealth; and the law afterward, by firm decree, hath approved that planetary motion, that unblameable exorbitancy in them.

No. XXII.

The Divine Law.

The hidden ways of his providence we adore and search not, but the law is his revealed will, his compleat, his evident, his certain will; herein he appears to us, as it were, in human shape, enters into covenant with us, swears to keep it, binds himself like a just Lawgiver, to his own prescriptions, gives himself to be understood by men, judges and is judged, measures and is commensurate to the right reason; cannot require less of us in one cantle of his law than in another; his legal justice cannot be so fickle and variable, sometimes like a devouring fire, and by and by connivent in the embers, or, if I may so say, oscitant and supine. The vigour of his law could no more remit, than the hallowed fire upon his altar could be let go out. The lamps that burned before him might need snuffing, but the light of his law never.

No. XXIII.

Liberty of Conscience.

Give me the liberty to know, to utter and to argue freely, according to conscience, above all liberties.

No. XXIV.

Liberty of Person.

And not to have in ourselves, though vaunting to be free-born, the power of our own freedom, and the public safety, is a degree lower than not to have the property of our own goods. For liberty of person and the right of self-preservation is much nearer, much more natural and more worth to all men, than the propriety of their goods and wealth.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

On the Use of Vocal and Instrumental Music in Public Worship.

[Continued from p. 47.]

Briefly to recapitulate. ᾼδω (*ado*) is clearly appropriated to the act of singing. Ὑμνεω (*humneo*) signifies to praise or celebrate, more especially, as it appears, by singing or repeating metrical compositions. ψαλλω (*psallo*) signifies to play on stringed instruments, to sing and at the same time play on instruments, to praise by such singing and playing.

I now proceed to consider the passages in which these words occur, excepting those only in which the word *psalm* is used in reference to the Book of Psalms, (viz. Luke xx. 42. xxiv. 41. Acts i. 20. xiii. 33) which need no explanation.

1. Acts xvi. 25. "And at midnight Paul and Silas prayed and sang praises to God." The original (προσευχομενοι ὑμνουν) may probably be thus rendered; but the more natural meaning is, 'prayed and praised God,' and so Schleusner translates it. Hammond* renders it, "Paul and Silas in their office of prayer used a hymn." Indeed if the idea of a critic in your Repository be correct,† the original makes the act of prayer cotemporary with the act of uttering praises; and, at any rate, the *literal* rendering is, 'praying gave praises to God,' which is very commonly done in our devotional services. There is something uncommonly interesting in the use of the animated expression of thanksgiving by singing in such circumstances; and I do not think it impossible that the apostle and his companion really did sing; but this is not said; and I presume we should not think less highly of their praise, if it proved to have been certainly unaccompanied with vocal melody.

2. Romans xv. 9. "As it is written, For this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name." "The original word *psalo*," says Macknight (who, as a Scotch divine, could have no prepossession in favour of instrumental music) "signifies to praise God with the voice accompanied with instrumental music." The passage is quoted from the Septuagint version of Psalm xviii. 49, where the Hebrew word is *zεmεr* (see the first note on ψαλλω); and it cannot be doubted, I think, that the Psalmist's object was rather the praise than the manner of the praise; but as far as the manner

---

* Preface to his Commentary on the Psalms.

† Primitivus (Monthly Rep. Vol. V. p. 190.) maintains, "that the present participle of the Greek language, without the article, when joined to a verb, and agreeing with the subject of that verb, ever refers to a time simultaneous with the time signified by the verb." If this canon be *universal*, then the praying and the praising could not be two distinct acts, at least so far as they must have been on the common interpretation of the passage. I have no doubt it is the *general* usage, and therefore content myself with saying, that "praying gave praises to God" is the natural and literal rendering.

is brought into view, the Alexandrian translators must have considered him as intending the use of singing with instrumental accompaniments. This indeed appears to have been the constant habit of David when uttering his psalms of praise. As the praise certainly is the leading object of the writer, and we have no word in our language which will denote praise by singing with instruments, I see no objection to translating it somewhat loosely, "I will acknowledge thee among the nations, I will publicly utter praises unto thy name." But if we think it best to employ words denoting the *manner* of the praise, in order to give the real force of the word, we must take care to avoid confining it to singing with the voice, exclusively of instruments, which the word does not signify.

3. 1 Cor. xiv. 15. "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also; I will sing (*psalo*) with the spirit, I will sing with the understanding also." We are here unable to employ a mode of explanation which was of assistance in the last passage. As it is not a translation from the Hebrew, we seem almost compelled to take the word in the sense in which, without restraint from another language, it would be understood by the Corinthian Christians. The apostle is rectifying the abuse of their spiritual gifts, too common in their public assemblies; and this verse shews what he would himself have done in their circumstances, and what of course he wished them to do. Their devotional expressions were not only to be prompted by the spirit, but to be under the guidance of the understanding. So far is clear, the only question is, what does the apostle mean when he uses the word ψαλω (*psalo*)? That the praise was the chief object cannot be doubted; but if he had meant praise without any reference to the manner of it, the Greek language supplied him with sufficient variety. If he referred to singing, to the *exclusion* of instrumental accompaniment, he had a word which he elsewhere employs, decidedly appropriated to *singing*. He was writing to a community consisting chiefly (see Acts xviii. 6.) of Gentile converts, accustomed while heathens to the use of instrumental music in their religious services, and residing in a city in which the arts were much studied and practised, a city of excessive luxury and refinement; and he employed a word peculiarly appropriated among the Greeks (when used in connection with music) to playing on instruments, or singing with instrumental accompaniment, and never used, in those days, for singing alone. *Psallo* does mean, I allow, to praise God (by singing with instrumental accompaniments); but it does not mean to praise God in any other way. The use of it would not have been admissible in reference to praise in general; I may say with confidence (as far as my present means of judgment enable me to decide, and I have sought for all I know of), that it would have been inadmissible in reference to singing *without* instruments, and still more so if the apostle had meant to *exclude* the use of instrumental accompaniments in devotional singing. The praise is here, of course, the chief object, as in the former passage,

but less exclusively, than in that, of the manner; yet, as we have no word fully corresponding to *psallo,* I should think it preferable to employ a more general term than *singing*, as the translation of it; since this, in our common use of it, and through particular associations in the minds of many (especially in reference to devotional exercises), almost implies the *absence* of instrumental accompaniments, which the original was so far from doing that it never meant singing exclusively. "I will praise with the spirit, I will praise with the understanding also," is rather a clumsy rendering, but if it does not convey the whole truth, it conveys nothing but the truth, which (through very common associations) will not be found to be the case with the expression, "I will sing," &c.

Are we then to suppose, that the Corinthians, when under the inspiration of the spirit they uttered the psalm of praise in their public assemblies, not only employed vocal melody, but accompanied the voice with instrumental music; that even the apostle Paul himself in such circumstances would have done so? The question at first considerably startled me, as it probably may some of your readers. I had long been accustomed to suppose, that the New Testament, if it does not condemn, at least furnishes no authority for the use of instrumental music in devotional exercises, whether public or private. And it is not without great hesitation, arising from old impressions, and from the earnest desire to avoid error myself, or leading others into error, that I answer those questions in the affirmative. But I do not see how the conclusion can be avoided till it has been shewn (and I know of no authority for it) that the word ψαλλω (*psallo*) would in the apostle's times have been understood by the Corinthians to mean singing *exclusively* or even *alone*. We must not judge of these things by our own ideas and manners. To us it appears strange, that the spirit-prompted effusions of devotion should be accompanied with instrumental music. To the Quakers it appears strange that they should be uttered even with vocal melody. Let us place ourselves back in the time and place referred to, and we shall find a wide difference. Music was a regular and even essential branch of education among the polished Greeks; their regular precomposed poetry, and even the unpremeditated effusions of genius, were sung with instrumental accompaniments; their hymns of praise to the Gods were accompanied with the harp or lyre. If the Gentile converts were not *forbidden* to use instrumental accompaniments with their spiritual songs, they would use them as a matter of course. Their music was extremely simple, and the lyre might be made to yield harmonious sounds without an effort of attention. They had abundant authority for the use of the harp, the psaltery, &c. in connexion with some of the finest specimens of devotional expression that ever were committed to writing. What should prevent the Corinthian Christian, when the spirit prompted the psalm of praise, from singing it to *his* lyre or psaltery? What should prevent the apostle? He was brought up in the schools of Tarsus, in all the learning of Greece; and music was a study even of the philosophers. He speaks of the beggarly elements of the law, but he does not class instrumental accompaniments among them, nor indeed could he, for they could not form a part of the Mosaic ritual. I will cheerfully retract the assertion if adequate reasons against it are produced; but till that is done, I must maintain that the passage under consideration fully authorizes the use of instrumental accompaniments, equally as much as vocal melody in uttering the psalm of praise in the public assemblies of the Christians.

I have only further to observe on the passage, that singing in the Christian assemblies at Corinth, was (as far as can be gathered from this epistle) nothing more than the act of an individual, singing (with instrumental accompaniments) what the spirit prompted, either at the time, or previously to their meeting together. "Here it may be observed," says Locke, "that as in their public prayers, one prayed and the others held their peace, so it was in their singing, at least in that singing which was of extempore hymns, by the impulse of the spirit." As far as public worship is concerned I know of no adequate evidence to prove that there was any other singing than this.

4. 1 Cor. xiv. 26. "How is it then, brethren? When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm;" or rather, interrogatively, "Hath each of you a psalm, hath he a doctrine?" &c. The passage clearly means, that one had a psalm, another a discourse, and so on; not that all had the same psalm, the same discourse, &c. See Locke, Beausobre, Macknight, &c.

5. Eph. v. 19. I. V. "And be not drunk with wine, wherein is dissoluteness; but be filled with the spirit; speaking to one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing (*adontes*) and making melody (*psallontes*) with your hearts to the Lord." The first thing to be observed on this passage is, that it has nothing to do with public worship. The reader who will consult Mr. Peirce's note (b) on Col. iii. 16, will perceive great reason to believe, that even that passage refers to the common intercourse of Christians, especially at their social entertainments. I will not say that the apostle does not particularly refer to their love-feasts (though I know no proof that he does); but I think the connexion strongly implies that he does not refer to their public assemblies for worship.* 2. As to the distinction between psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, there is much room for conjecture; but the opinion of Crellius (on Col. iii. 16.) appears to me the most plausible. "*Psalms*," he says, "are songs which were usually sung with some musical instrument, and they are more comprehensive in their subject than *hymns*, which contained the praises of the Deity, but psalms may include

---

* Slichtingius I observe is of the same opinion. Locke in his Paraphrase says, "Seek not diversion in the noisy and intemperate jollity of drunkenness; but when you are disposed to a cheerful entertainment of one another, &c." Chandler says, "Instead of those impure and drunken songs, which the heathens use in their festivals, let your conversation be enlightened and refreshed, &c."

both prayers and thanksgivings, and many things relating to duty, and the happiness of mankind.* *Spiritual songs* is a very general expression, used in distinction from profane and worldly songs." 3. The grand point is, respecting the distinction between singing (*adontes*), and the word (*psallontes*) which is translated, making melody (or rather harmony). After the statements which I have adduced respecting the import of the latter (in No. 3, and under the word itself) the reader will be prepared for the position, that if the former here signifies the use of vocal music, or singing properly so called, the latter as far as I can perceive, *must* mean playing on instruments of music, or singing with instrumental accompaniments. I see no room for doubt, that we should literally render the apostle's words, and give them their exact force, if we were to say, "singing and playing, with our hearts to the Lord." The ambiguity of the last word, and the awkward associations connected with it by constant use, would make me averse from employing it in a translation of the scriptures, and (as we have no word of exactly the same force as *psallo*) I should not object to the more general rendering, "singing and making harmony;" but then it should be clearly understood, that this harmony was by accompanying the voice with instrumental music, the lyre, harp, or psaltery for instance. By those who feel difficulties in admitting this interpretation, it should be remembered, that Ionia was the land of music, and the Ephesians would naturally employ instrumental accompaniments with their spiritual songs, unless it had been forbidden them; that the apostle, so far from doing this, actually makes use of the word the most appropriate in the Greek language to playing upon stringed instruments, or singing with such accompaniments, and which was never used to denote singing exclusively; and consequently, that at least he cannot be supposed to *discountenance* singing with instrumental accompaniments; still farther, that he must be understood by those to whom he addressed his letter, (unless he explained its meaning in oral communication,) as authorising their employment of instrumental as well as vocal music with their spiritual songs.

I know but of two interpretations which oppose these ideas. The first may be derived from Schleusner, so as to leave *all* musical modulation out of view. But I think I have sufficiently shown, that neither *αδω* (*ado*) nor *ψαλλω* (*psallo*) will allow of this extreme generalization of their meanings. The second is what is given by some of those very valuable commentators, the Fratres Poloni. "The heart," says Crellius on the passage, "is like a musical instrument, which we ought to strike and play upon, so as to bring forth sounds and words," And in his Christian Ethics (as above quoted) he says, in reference to this clause, "by the former word expressing singing with the voice alone, by the latter compound singing, singing with instruments, elegantly comparing the heart with a musical instrument; as though (he says) we ought to sing with the voice, and at the same time to touch the heart itself, whence the sweetest harmony would arise and melody the most pleasing to God."* This is certainly a very beautiful idea; but, from the following considerations taken together, it seems to me more ingenious than just. (1.) The original of the word heart is never used in the New Testament to denote the organ of the body. If it here mean the affections, the supposed metaphor seems to lose its beauty. (2.) The apostle is not distinguishing between formal worship and spiritual worship, but between the revellings and riotous singing and music of the Gentile banquets, and the religious music of the Christians. (3.) In the corresponding passage in Col. iii. 16. we find singing with the heart, without (*psallontes*) playing or singing with accompaniments: if therefore we are to suppose the playing to be merely that of the heart, we must also suppose the singing to have the same limit. In other words, if the playing were not really playing on instruments, but merely exciting the affections, the same must be said of the singing also. If the authority which this passage affords for instrumental accompaniments with devotional singing, is dissipated by the admission of the figurative interpretation, the authority which both passages afford for vocal modulation in devotional exercises must also be destroyed. But (4.) the expression in or with the heart, though it might have the meaning assigned by Crellius, is, with equal propriety and much more agreeably to Paul's own use of it, interpreted, *with the affections*, *with sincerity*, *with inward devotion of soul.* So in Rom. x. 9. "If thou shalt believe in thine heart;" that is, with sincerity, with inward affection, with a practical conviction.* (5.) If we are, in this case to consider the apostle as representing the heart as the instrument, why not the instrument with which the Christians were to play, as well as the piece of music on which they were to play?* Consider the heart, the inward affection of piety, as that which prompts the voice and guides the hand, and we have (I think) at least as beautiful a metaphor as that of Crellius. And (6) the apostle uses the word psallo, as I have already shown (No. 3.) in circumstances which will not allow of this mode of interpretation; it is by no means necessary nor very appropriate here; and it is a refinement which would scarcely be understood by the Ephesians, well versed, as Paul's Epistle shows, in the Septuagint, unless the connection had shown, which assuredly it does not, that the apostle was contrasting the music of the voice and lute with the music of the heart. The use of instrumental and vocal music was to be accompanied with the heart, with sincere and devotional affection; or, however well executed, it could have no religious value; but that the heart should be employed, could not, from the words of the apostle, be supposed to exclude the use of either. In fine, the simple meaning of the passage is, that, in their spiritual songs, they were to accompany their vocal and instrumental melody with their inward affections; these were to be excited by their harmony, these were to prompt their harmony.

---

* In his note on Eph. v. 19, he says, that hymns seem to be songs employed without any musical instrument; but he is mistaken if he means as a general statement: for the Athenians we find (see Wetstein) sung their hymns to the harp.

---

* To much the same effect Slichtingius (Eph. v. 19,) observes, "As if he had said, although all modulation of voice were absent, it is sufficient if the heart be present; for this will serve you for plectrum and all musical instruments." This however goes farther than the interpretation of Crellius, and is certainly less accurate and ingenious. Without a doubt, the modulation of the voice and instrumental accompaniments are not necessary to render the exercises of devotion acceptable; nor can these avail any thing if the heart be wanting. But this is not the apostle's object. He does not direct to let the exercise of the heart serve *instead of* vocal and instrumental music, but *while using these* to do it with the heart, with inward affection and sincerity. Slichtingius (but not Crellius) carries the same mode of interpretation into Col. iii. 16; but, in my apprehension, that passage (clearly corresponding to the present) shows that the heart (or devotional affection) is not to be regarded figuratively as the instrument, but as the prompting cause or necessary accompaniment, or effect, or altogether.

* See also the following passages, in which, among others, καρδια, (heart) occurs with the preposition εν (*in*, *by*, or *with*, &c.) Matthew xxii. 37. "with all thy heart." Mark iv. 15, xi. 23. Luke xxiv. 38. Acts v. 4. "Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart?" Rom ii. 15. x. 6. 1 Cor. vii. 37. "Standeth firm in his heart—and determineth thus in his heart." That εν may signify *by*, as the impulsive cause: see Luke iv. 1. "Led by the spirit" (compare Matthew iv. 1. Mark i. 12). That it may signify the instrumental cause, or the necessary accompaniment, of an action: see (among very many other places) Rom. i. 9

6. Col. iii. 16. " Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, gratefully singing (*adontes*) with your hearts to God;" R. T. " to the Lord." I believe there is no necessity for many remarks on this passage. It very much corresponds with the preceding, from the Epistle to the Ephesians; and indeed both epistles, as is generally admitted, were written at the same period.* Εν χαριτι, *with grace*,

---

" Whom I serve with (εν) my spirit." xii. 8. " With liberality," " with diligence," " with cheerfulness." Eph. i. 3. " With every spiritual blessing." ii. 7. " By his kindness." iii. 5. " By the spirit." iv. 2. " Bearing one another in love." iv. 17. v. 9. v. 18. " With the spirit." vi. 5. " With singleness of heart." vi. 15. " Shod with preparation." vi. 18. " Praying with (εν) your spirit and teaching with (εν) perseverance." vi. 24. " With purity."

* David was to play on his harp, (εν τη κινυρᾳ αυτου) and he played on it with his hand (εν τη χειρι αυτου). See the Sept. in 1 Kings xvi. 16, 23. xviii. 10. xix. 9, as quoted by Trommius. I have only Field's Sept. to consult, which follows the Vatican copy; and this wants xviii. 10; and in xix. 9. has not the preposition.

* Slichtingius considers the apostle as meaning, singing with the heart as with a musical instrument. This idea never could have occurred to him, I think, but for the corresponding passage in the Ephesians; and, instead of introducing this refined and, I believe, utterly unauthorised metaphor into the present passage, on the ground of the preceding, I should take it in its plain sense in the preceding, because it appears clearly to have that import in the present. I do not object to the idea he expresses in the latter part of his note (" that to sing with grace is to sing with the heart, although there be no modulation of the voice," and " that God and Christ do not require, nor take pleasure in organs and musical instruments, which yield gratification to men, while the heart only affords delight to God and Christ"); but only maintain, that the apostle, in these two passages does not mean, that the Christians should not use the voice

admits of different interpretations. "It may mean," says Mr. Peirce, "with thankfulness, which is very suitable to such an action; or else it may signify, with gracefulness or decency. I most incline to this latter sense, in which the phrase is used, chap. iv. 6. Let your speech be always with grace, that is gracefulness." Upon the whole, however, the former meaning seems to me best to suit the connection. In the note which I referred to in No. 5. Mr. Peirce observes, that the rule in the text stands among others given to the Christians to observe in their conversing together; and in accordance with this reference, which is strongly confirmed by the parallel passage in the Ephesians, he considers the singing here prescribed, as not for their public assemblies, but for their private intercourses. This is also the opinion of Hammond. (Preface to Comm. on the Psalms.)

7. Hebrews ii. 12. "In the midst of the church I will sing unto thee." The Improved Version is more correct. "I will praise thee." The original is the future of ὑμνεω (*humneo*); and though it may mean, "I will praise by singing," the only certain force of it is, "I will praise or celebrate." The Hebrew, in the original, (Psalm xxii. 22.) is *elel*, to praise.

8. James v. 13. I. V. "Is any cheerful, let him sing praise to God." In the original there is only one word employed for the last clause, viz. the imperative of *psallo*. The P. V. is here more literal, "Let him sing psalms." The object of the apostle clearly is the praise or thanksgiving, rather than the manner of it; and since we have no word (as has been before repeated) exactly corresponding to *psallo*, it would probably lead less into error, if we translated it, "let him offer praises." But as far as the reference is to music at all, it includes the use of instrumental as well as vocal melody. And, though I am satisfied that a person, under the influence of religious cheerfulness, complies with the *spirit* of the injunction, when singing or repeating the psalm of praise, or when praising God without any premeditated composition, or when praising him without the use of the voice at all, with that best of all melody, the music of the heart, yet I do not hesitate to maintain, that if the Christian, in such circumstances, expresses the effusions of his heart with vocal melody and instrumental accompaniments, he is *exactly* following the direction of the apostle. It is to be observed, that this passage also has no reference to the services of public worship, but to the private devotions of the Christians. Benson remarks, "These two directions," concerning prayer when they were afflicted, and praise when they were easy and cheerful, "seem to me to refer to their private devotion, and not to their public worship; for if one person was afflicted and another quite easy, what would suit one would, according to this rule of the apostle, have been unfit for the other." So again, "The apostle does not appear to me to have designed it for any thing, but as a rule of private worship."

9. There are some passages in

---

and instrumental accompaniments in their spiritual songs, but simply, that these should be attended with the heart, with the inward affections.

the Revelations which may be noticed, to render the enumeration complete. Chap. v. 9. xiv. 3. "And they sing a new song." Chap. xv. 3. "And they sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb." In these instances, the verb is *ado* and the substantive *udé;* and no additional remark appears necessary. Several passages occur in which instrumental music is spoken of. Thus, in chap. v. 8. and xv. 2. the elders and those who had gained the victory over the beast, are represented as having harps, the latter, "harps of God;" and a reference is probably made to the same in chap. xiv. 2. In chap. xviii. 22, it is declared, (among other circumstances, showing the utter desolation with which the prophetical Babylon was to be visited,) "And the sound of harpers, and of musicians, and of pipers, and of trumpeters, shall by no means be heard any more in thee." But this last passage, I imagine, in no way bears upon the inquiry; and, for the same reason, I have not thought it necessary particularly to enumerate 1 Cor. xiii. 1. where the apostle, without any reference to religious worship, speaks of the sounding brass and noisy cymbal clearly as unmeaning instruments; nor ch. xiv. 7, where he speaks of the pipe, or harp, or trumpet, as affording no direction and producing no effect on the mind, unless there be a distinction in their sounds. I have, I think, heard that this last passage is considered as opposing the use of instrumental accompaniments when singing the spiritual song; but I am utterly at a loss to see how, in any way, it bears upon the subject.

10. The only other passage, I believe, in which any of the words occur which refer to the present subject, are Matthew xxvi. 30. Mark xiv, 26. where, in the P. V. we find, "And when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives." The original for the first clause is the participle from ὑμνεω (*humneo*): see under the word and No. 7. This, by Newcome, was rendered "when they had used a hymn;" and in the I. V. it is rendered, "when they had recited a hymn." It may mean, that our Saviour and his apostles sang a hymn; or, that they repeated a hymn; or simply, that they offered thanksgivings and praises to God. I do not know that there is any thing absolutely to decide our choice among these meanings. The later Jewish writers say, that several psalms were either recited or sung during the actual celebration of the passover. But their accounts can be but little depended upon, when they profess to give minute statements of the services, &c. before the destruction of Jerusalem. Perhaps it may be truly said, that they knew less about many of those circumstances than we ourselves do. But if it were the fact, that the Jews, in our Saviour's time, did sing or chaunt psalms during the paschal supper, then the evangelist represents our Saviour as doing so; if not, as no other instance occurs to authorize the supposition that our Saviour employed vocal music in his devotions, and it did not, in this instance peculiarly suit the passing circumstances, I should consider the evangelist as merely representing our Saviour and his apostles as offering thanksgivings, or at most

repeating a psalm of praise. As far as I can find, singing was not employed in the Synagogue service at the time of our Lord. Mention is made of singing in Beausobre's Introduction, as forming a part of the afternoon service; but if that writer were not altogether mistaken, I believe there is no sufficient authority for supposing this to have been the case in our Saviour's time; and if it were not, we have no proof that our Saviour ever sang. What music there was in the Temple service, (whether vocal or instrumental,) the people at large had no immediate share with it; and indeed the Temple service seems to have had very little resemblance to what we understand by public worship. It was rather the service of the Priests and Levites alone, in behalf of the people of Israel; and the people seem to have been concerned merely as spectators. The Temple was often employed as a place of private devotion; but never, I imagine (at least not generally), for what is strictly speaking, public worship.

The preceding examination affords I think satisfactory evidence for the following conclusions.

(1.) We have no authority from our Saviour to introduce either vocal or instrumental music into public worship. I do not mean that he has given any injunctions directly opposing either; but simply that we have not his authority in favour of it. We are left precisely as we are with respect to the parts and regulation of public worship in general.

(2.) It is very uncertain whether we have any authority from our Saviour's example, to use vocal music in the more private exercises of devotion; and certainly we have none for the use of instrumental music. If either, or both, are contrary to his general principle of worship (John iv. 24.) then they are virtually forbidden; if not, the matter is left entirely to our own discretion.

(3.) We have very good authority for the use of vocal music in the more private exercises of devotion. See Nos. 5, 6; also 8.

(4.) We have, I think, equally good authority for the employment of instrumental music accompanying singing, in our more private exercises of devotion. See Nos. 5, 8.

(5.) There is express authority, in the apostle's own words, for an individual's using vocal and instrumental music together, when uttering the psalm of praise, under the promptings of the spirit, in the public assemblies of the Christians. See No. 3.

As doubt may be entertained respecting the last two positions, (though I do not know on what critical grounds it can rest,) I think it best to view the subject negatively, and add,

(6.) That the manner in which the apostles express themselves, in the circumstances of the case, (taking into account the constant import of the word *psallo* in connection with music, and the customs of the age and countries for which they wrote,) completely excludes the supposition, that they regarded the use of instrumental music, in connection with devotional singing, as inconsistent with the nature of devotion, or of the Christian system. See Nos. 3, 5, 6, 8.*

---

* I also infer from the passages in the

(7) As the spirit of the apostle's directions is equally maintained, whether the hymn of devotion be prompted by the miraculous influence of the spirit, or by the ordinary spirit of devotion, or be accompanied with the exercise of this spirit—whether it be uttered by an individual separately, or by many together—whether it be in the usual social intercourses of life, or in religious meetings—whether in private assemblies, or in public worship, it appears to me that they afford apostolic justification of singing in such circumstances, when the heart accompanies the song of praise; and equal justification of accompanying our singing with instrumental music. But I do not perceive that the New Testament affords us any express authority (perhaps I might say any authority at all) for making singing a regular stated part of public worship, in which all the congregation are expected to join, and still less for singing in parts, a practice which was not begun for several centuries after the apostolic age. For this we have not of course apostolic directions in our favour; for the use of instrumental music with vocal, in devotional exercises, if my reasoning is not altogether groundless, we certainly have. But at any rate, from the whole examination of this particular subject, and all that relates to religious worship in the New Testament, I infer

(8) That the minute regulation of public worship, the parts of which it should be composed, the time and manner in which it should be performed, are all absolutely left without any restraint (except from the general principles already mentioned) to the discretion and experience of Christians, according to their respective circumstances, social, mental and religious. In some respects we might be well pleased to find a precise formulary of public worship in the New Testament; but in all probability it would have been attended with very injurious effects. It could not have been accommodated to all circumstances, it would have prevented the exercise of the understanding, and thereby often interfered with the culture of the devotional affections, and it would have made more formalists than it could have assisted, beyond what we are already assisted, by the invaluable principles which the New Testament affords us. As it is, we are, I conceive, indisputably left to the guidance of those general principles, in every thing that respects the parts, manner, and regulation of our public religious services.

I have long perceived with great regret that I am widely trespassing upon your limits, and upon the patience of your readers; but I have reason to believe that the inquiry itself (though perhaps not the manner in which I have conducted it) will be interesting at this time, to many of your readers in different parts of the kingdom; and I know not how to make a division without injury to the train of argument. If you can indulge me thus far, I will promise to be more brief in my subsequent letters. In my next I shall state what information I have been able to collect from original

---

Revelations, that the use of instrumental music, united with vocal, could not be abhorrent to the principles or feelings of the first Christians.

and other sources, respecting the practice and opinions of the Christians in the first two centuries after the ministry of Christ, respecting the use of vocal and instrumental music in general, and the employment of it in public worship, together with some facts respecting the changes which afterwards took place in this part of the religious services; and in my third (and I hope last) letter, I propose to consider the reasons for and against the use of instrumental music in connexion with devotional singing. I am, Sir, (with best wishes for the increasing spread and usefulness of your important publication during the succeeding year) yours very truly,

Exeter, *Dec.* 1812. L. C.

On Acts iv. 28.

Sir,

Your respectable correspondent J. T. E. [Vol. VII. 753, 754.] seems to understand the prayer of the apostles, Acts iv. 28, as implying that his persecutors were gathered together to do the will of God, by putting to death the holy Jesus—that he was delivered to their hands by the determinate counsel, as well as the foreknowledge of God, and that the act of crucifying him was necessary, or in effect, that they were impelled to act as they did. But I conceive that it was not the meaning of these praying people to teach such a doctrine: it is inconsistent with the general strain of their prayer, as well as with the declaration, that, with *wicked* hands they, (his persecutors) had slain him. If we suppose the words in the latter part of the 27th verse to be a parenthesis, or to have been misplaced by some careless copier, and take the liberty of reducing them into their proper order, the text will read thus: For of a truth, *against thy holy child Jesus whom thou hast anointed, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together.* In this posture the text is consistent with the petition of the apostles, that they might be enabled to speak the word boldly, notwithstanding the threats of their opponents; and it makes Jesus, and not his enemies, appear to have acted according to the determinate counsel of God. Let the doctrine of philosophical necessity, true or false, stand on its own basis; but let not the apostles of our Lord be pressed into its service. Had they wished to teach that it was the will of God, that his enemies should gather themselves together against him, the apostles would not have charged them with having slain him with wicked hands. The doctrine of necessity which J. T. E. seems to approve may be true, but it does not seem to have been the design of the writers of the New Testament to teach it. It may be of use to men of reading and much reflection, but not to the generality of Christians, who are not prepared to benefit by it.

I am, Sir, yours,

J. I.

OBITUARY.

Mr. Joseph Jefferies Evans.

Died, December 22d, 1812, in the 45th year of his age, Mr. JOSEPH JEFFERIES EVANS, Merchant, after a long and painful illness, and he was interred on Dec. 31st, in Bunhill Fields, by his relative the Rev. John Evans, agreeably to the particular request of the deceased. His remains were followed to the grave by a numerous train of mourners, who loved and revered his memory. The *Address*, which was of some length, was listened to with seriousness and attention. It has been printed for private circulation, by the desire of the family, and having been furnished with a copy, we give the following *extract*, which more immediately regards the deceased.

" Standing around *an opened grave*, I would fain impress upon your minds the great doctrine of IMMORTALITY. We are committing to the bosom of the cold earth the remains of a dear relative and a faithful friend, of a valuable and highly respectable member of society. In a Will, evidently written by him with deliberation and seriousness, he acknowledges his belief in an omnipotent and good God, in Jesus Christ his Son, whom he hath sent, and in a future state of rewards and punishment. But with *many wise and good men* he held that punishment was to be salutary in its nature, and of course temporary in its duration. Indeed his mind was of no common cast. Naturally strong, it was expanded by a liberal education given him by his excellent father, and it was improved by a love of reading, which never forsook him amidst the busiest concerns of mercantile life, and which indeed continued till within a few weeks of his decease. His intellectual energies were equalled only by his moral worth, which he manifested throughout the whole of his career. His disposition was benevolent, and he delighted TO DO GOOD. I have myself witnessed his readiness to serve others, and have marked the pleasure which he received when he found his efforts in behalf of the needy and distressed attended with success. Numerous also were his subscriptions to charitable institutions—*his* indeed were the beneficent virtues of the heart.

" In his *last* illness there were alleviating circumstances, of which his *amiable relict* and *nearest relatives* were sensible, and which with THEM form a ground of thankfulness to the Supreme Being. And it must be a source of no small consolation to the survivors, that every thing was done which affection could suggest, or the tenderest assiduity accomplish. But, alas! his case was irremediable. No medical skill (and the best was procured) could afford an effectual relief. Upon the opening of the body, agreeably to his desire, a peculiarity attaching to that vital organ, *the heart*, was found to be the immediate cause of dissolution. His case indeed was so singular as to be pronounced, ' that if ever it had appeared before, it was of exceeding rarity.' It was, however, his felicity, after much occasional bodily suffering, to retain his faculties to the last, and to be favoured with a gentle dissolution.—*He died in peace!*

"With respect to *the deceased*, I have no hesitation in adopting the following account, drawn up by a *much respected relative*,—who knew him well and loved him sincerely. 'With a vigorous, comprehensive and enlightened mind, HE possessed a liberal and benevolent heart. All the various duties of domestic, social and public life, he discharged with an affection, a generosity, and an integrity which will ever endear his memory to his afflicted family and to a large circle of sympathising friends. He was a son of *the late Dr. Caleb Evans*, of Bristol, and exemplified in his own conduct all the active and benevolent virtues of his VENERATED PARENT.' "

Mrs. A. Scott.

Died, Jan. 8, 1813, at her house in Birmingham, ANN, relict of William SCOTT, Esq.

Her memory cannot be so much honoured by any delineation of her character as by the grief which is felt throughout a large town and neighbourhood on her decease, and by the high esteem with which she will ever be spoken of among those who had the happiness of intimately knowing her. It is fit, however, for the admonition and instruction of the living, that her virtues be not unrecorded. Amidst examples of corruption and degeneracy, it is soothing to contemplate "whatever is venerable, lovely and of good report:" amidst many a distressing scene in the domestic circle and on the theatre of the world, it is consoling to repose our views on some of the fairest fruits of Christian faith, exhibited without ostentation in daily life.

The tree which produced such fruits could not but be sound: the principle from which such habits resulted, could not but be of heavenly origin. They who were long acquainted with this excellent woman, easily traced her virtues to the divine blessing on the religious impressions which she received in childhood.

She was born in 1730, of pious parents: in *this descent* she humbly gloried; and it influenced her feelings, her attachments and her deportment through her following years. Her father (the Rev. John Poncks) sustained the character of a minister of religion: the bounty of Providence enabled him to render services which were almost gratuitous to some Dissenting congregations in the vicinity of Birmingham;* nor were his instructions and his example lost upon his only child. By the lessons delivered, by the order observed, *at home,* as well as by the useful ministry of Mr. Bourn and of his much esteemed immediate successors, she was formed to a temper remarkably meek, affectionate, beneficent and pious. At that period, the education of daughters was somewhat different from what it frequently is at the present day; it was no irrational and enfeebling system. If many of the accomplishments, as they are styled, of modern times were not comprehended in its provisions, it was a stranger, nevertheless, to fashionable indulgencies and ease. More of manly self denial was inculcated: and the idea of *accountableness*, both to earthly parents and superiors, and to a heavenly Judge and Father, was more anxiously implanted in the tender mind. The young were exhorted to live for immortality: nor was it supposed that they could be good and serviceable while they were irreligious.

---

* Dr. Toulmin's Memoirs of Mr. Bourn, pp. 280, 281.

Such, in general, was the education, the discipline, with which this valuable person was blessed: and it was eminently favourable to all her important interests. If she bore in her youth the yoke of adversity and of restraint, her character was, in consequence, more exemplary than if she had been rocked in luxury and self-indulgence: if she was not *early* introduced into *various* society, she was happily exempted from its ensnaring influences; and her heart was not divided between the world and God.

Uniformly kind and generous, her disposition to do good increased with her means of gratifying this darling inclination. Here her memory shines in the brightest light. We too often observe, that the heart contracts with age, and that the love of wealth is proportioned to a man's added stores. But the case of the subject of this memoir was directly the reverse. The greater the abundance bestowed on her by a liberal Providence, the more freely did she give to others. Her language was, "I am a steward for my heavenly master." And, as the shadows of her evening lengthened, she repeatedly said, "Since I cannot live long, let it be my care, while I live, to do all the service in my power to my fellow creatures." Her bounty perpetually flowed in almost every conceivable channel, and was never interrupted by caprice and humour. Pure and refreshing, it gladdened the eyes and the feelings of beholders. More frequently, unseen by men, it visited the dry and thirsty land where before there was no water, cheered the humble cottage and, by its influences, caused the orphan's and the widow's heart to sing for joy. Whenever religion, humanity, friendship solicited her aid; whenever youth needed instruction, or age repose, her assistance was readily imparted. In very many instances, indeed, and as often as was practicable, the solicitation was delicately anticipated: and her public donations, though numerous and large, were fewer and less considerable than her private charities.

Many young and deserving persons, at their entrance into trade, she supplied with loans of money, on moderate interest: and she was accustomed to speak with particular gratitude and pleasure of the success which followed, in not a few cases, this application of her wealth.

Far from being confined to these acts, her benevolence was the habit of Christian love. It eminently answered to the fine picture of charity drawn by an apostle's pen. Although it may be declared of her, as the sacred historian declared of the ornament of the church at Joppa, "She was full of good works and alms-deeds which she did," her *temper* must not be forgotten. Many weep over her grave besides those who, with sighs and tears, there shew "the garments which she made while she was with them." There are many who can attest her hospitality and courtesy, the engaging affection of her disposition and manners, and the humility and blamelessness of her demeanour in all the intercourses of society. The law of kindness dwelt upon her lips. She was in the practice of condescending to men of low estate. Wealth and station made no inroads on her heart; for her "the desire of the eyes and the pride of life" had no attractions. That she might more effectually relieve the wants, and promote the comfort of her brethren, she was content to forego what are the usual appendages of opulence and elevated circumstances. To do good was her daily business, her meat and drink. Nor were her bounties limited by considerations of sect and party: they were perfectly catholic. Firm to her own principles, she knew how to respect others in the conscientious exercise of their's.

Arrived at "a period which renders every life venerable," she was still calm and placid amidst the infirmities of age, still desirous of saving trouble to those around her. Conscience bore its cheerful testimony in her behalf; the hope of the gospel was the stedfast support, the habitual consolation of her mind. A life of more than common usefulness and honour, was closed in peace, and without any pain: and she now sleeps in Jesus, awaiting that crown of righteousness to which she humbly looked forward, not as a debt, but as a boon, as "the free gift of God in Jesus Christ our Lord," and ripe for a state where piety and benevolence shall find their amplest, and an everlasting gratification.

To persons who are blessed with those means of doing good, which superior wealth bestows, she was a pattern by which it well becomes them to frame their own views and conduct. Her almost unparalleled liberality in the use of riches, a liberality by which she was known even in distant quarters of the kingdom, is a striking contrast both with the sordid tempers of the sons of avarice, and with the folly and the crime of those whose affluence is expended, so far as their own will and disposition are concerned, on self-gratification, on irrational pursuits, on vicious luxuries, of those who lay up treasures for themselves, but are not rich towards God!

INTELLIGENCE.

Mr. Wright's Tour in the North-west.

[Concluded from p. 61.]

General Remarks, &c.

1. To the ministers of the different congregations I visited, who aided me with their advice in arranging my plans, welcomed me to their pulpits, and did all they could to promote the objects of my mission, I feel greatly indebted—they have my sincere thanks. They enabled me to make exertions which I could not have made without them, at

least not with equal advantage. Never have I met with persons who have entered more heartily into our views and plans, than most of the ministers I have had intercourse with during this journey. Some of them exerted themselves very much to extend and promote the success of my labours; I will not however mention individuals, being convinced that I had the best wishes of our brethren in the ministry, in the different places where I was called to labour, and they shewed a constant readiness to strengthen me in the work. With many of them whom I had not seen before, or merely seen once, I formed a pleasing intimacy, which I trust will only terminate with our lives, and will be revived and perpetuated in a better state.

2. I must also express the obligations I am under to many gentlemen in the congregations I visited, for their friendship, kind attentions, and their zealous exertions to promote the success of my labours as an Unitarian missionary. Never in any journey had I such frequent opportunities of being in large parties of well-informed, zealous Christians, where extensive knowledge, cheerful piety, true liberality, and ardent zeal, were combined in so high a degree. These social meetings, I trust, were productive of much good, they gave me a very high degree of pleasure, and I sincerely thank those persons who were instrumental in procuring them.

3. It has often occurred to me that Unitarians do not yet know either their numbers or their strength. Prior to my undertaking this journey, though I had conceived there were many Unitarians in Lancashire and Cheshire, I had no adequate idea of the progress Unitarianism has made in those counties; I did not conceive the congregations were so numerous or so large as many of them are; much less had I expected to find them in so lively and prosperous a state. In both counties some congregations are still very low, and a want of zeal is to be lamented; but this is far from being generally the case, many of them are flourishing, and have no small degree of that zeal which is according to knowledge. I rejoiced greatly to find the progress which rational views of Christianity have made in the parts I recently visited, during the last few years.

4. The revival of Unitarianism in Warrington, Manchester, and in the district twelve miles round Manchester, is to be ascribed to the popular and active measures, which have been adopted by the ministers and their brethren. I take the liberty of stating what some of these measures are, 1. The plainly speaking out, or with openness, firmness, and candour, fully declaring what we believe to be the truth of God, both in the pulpit and out of it. Unless this be done, how are the people to be informed, or fortified against the seductions of error? Happily, many of our brethren in the ministry have been convinced of the necessity of doing this, and it is hoped ere long the conviction will become universal. 2. A change has taken place in the mode of preaching; the dry, ethical mode, has given place to the preaching of Unitarianism as the doctrine of the gospel; Christian discourses

have been filled with the sentiments and language of the gospel; in this way the best morality has been placed on the best foundation, evangelical righteousness on evangelical principles. 3. In addition to the provincial meeting, a quarterly meeting has been established, and carried on for some time, in which the ministers and members of different congregations have opportunity of associating together, and of holding that Christian intercourse which tends to promote brotherhood and zeal. Besides the quarterly, a monthly meeting is held by a few ministers, &c. 4. The members of congregations have begun to exert themselves, to second the efforts of their ministers; in this respect several gentlemen at Warrington, have set a noble example to the members of other congregations, by their steady and zealous exertions in the cause of divine truth. 5. The circulation of small tracts, and the establishment of congregational libraries. 6. The establishment of schools, and the attention paid to the youth in the congregations. 7. The holding of meetings for the free discussion of theological subjects. 8. The members of a congregation associating together, and having brotherly intercourse with each other. Such are the measures which have rendered congregations prosperous and advanced the general cause.

5. I have stated the above, not only as matter of information, but because I think such measures worthy of general adoption, and that it is highly important to the interest of truth to adopt them. If I might take so great a liberty, I would say to my brethren every where, Let Unitarianism shew itself openly, as it really is, the doctrine of the gospel: let Unitarians hold monthly, quarterly and annual meetings in every district where it can be rendered practicable: then the way will be prepared for an annual meeting of the whole Unitarian body, to concentrate their strength, and combine their exertions in promotion of the most important objects. Let the members of congregations exert themselves in every possible way to second the efforts of their ministers, and promote the success of their labours. Let every congregation have its library, its schools, its meeting for free discussion, and become, as much as possible, a Christian brotherhood. Let these things be done, and the effects will be good and great.

6. A district meeting is projected for Warrington and the neighbouring places; it is hoped this project will be realized; and it is highly desirable a plan for village preaching should be connected with it.

7. It would materially serve the cause if an auxiliary committee to the Unitarian Fund was formed at Manchester. It is hoped our brethren there will take this into serious consideration.

8. It has been said that Unitarian congregations consist, chiefly, of persons of learning and opulence; this is no doubt the case in some instances; but it is far from being generally the case. In the parts of the country I have lately visited, many of the congregations, and large congregations too, consist chiefly of persons of the lower and middling classes. I have had abundant proof, that whilst Unitarian Chris-

tianity approves itself to men of learning and highly cultivated mind, it is capable of becoming the religion of the poor.

9. During this journey I preached Unitarianism in nine places where it had not been preached before.

10. On the whole, Unitarians appear to me more numerous in Lancashire and Cheshire than in any other district I have yet visited. The prospect is most cheering; if proper exertions be continued, increased and extended, the pure gospel of Christ must spread on every side, and multitudes who now sit in the shades of error and superstition, will come and walk in the light of it. I hope our brethren in the above counties, will feel and exert their whole strength. Let their efforts be combined, their various resources be called forth, their full strength be united and well-directed; and I predict, that, before many years, Unitarianism will be the preponderating system in many parts of Lancashire and Cheshire.

11. Some persons, have been illiberal enough to suppose, that an Unitarian missionary is apt to obtrude himself where his labours are not desired: so far from this being the case, as in most other journeys, so in this, I have gone to no place where I was not invited to go, and have not had time to visit all the places to which I was invited.

12. Justice to our plans forbids my concealing that many of our brethren in the ministry, and others, expressed to me the sense they had of the importance of my journey and labours among them; they expressed that they were fully persuaded, much good would result from my visit among them at the present juncture. I certainly would not have mentioned this but as an answer to the question, why should an Unitarian missionary go among those who are already Unitarians?

13. I cannot express the pleasure I have felt in the course of this journey. My heart has sometimes overflowed with joy while witnessing the rapid progress of truth, the success of plans, which commenced under every discouragement, and which have succeeded, beyond our most sanguine expectations. To be so highly honoured by the Almighty as to be an instrument, however humble, in assisting in carrying on so great and glorious a work, as the revival of pure and primitive Christianity, fills me with unspeakable joy. This journey has been full of labour, I wished it to be so, it is labour that amply rewards itself. In no journey have I preached with more uniform pleasure, nor enjoyed higher satisfaction in social meetings and the intercourses of Christian friendship. What I have seen of the information, Christian zeal and affection of my brethren, I shall ever remember, and it will cause me to rejoice for many days to come.

Finally, I cannot conclude without a few valedictory lines, to those among whom I have recently laboured. — Farewell, ye dear friends, among whom I have laboured with so much pleasure, among whom I have spent, what I shall ever deem some of the happiest days of my life. May every blessing be your portion; may you have all the happiness your virtues fit you to enjoy; may your Christian knowledge, mutual love and liberal zeal continually increase; may all your efforts in the cause of Divine truth, be crowned with success; and may you have the sublime happiness to see error and superstition, vice and misery, banished far from your tabernacles, by the effulgent light and divine power of the pure gospel of Christ. Whether we shall meet again in this world, God only knows; be that as it may, the remembrance of you will remain with me while I live: and though we must die, the cause in which we are engaged can never perish, it will live and become universally triumphant.

I remain, dear Sir,
Very truly, yours, &c.
R. WRIGHT.

PEACE.

[Under this head, we mean to insert accounts of the proceedings of our countrymen, to put a stop to the crimes, miseries and horrors of War.—Communications on this subject are requested from our Readers. ED.]

Nottingham Resolutions and Petition.

At a numerous and respectable meeting of the BURGESSES and INHABITANTS of the town of NOTTINGHAM, and county of the same, and the precincts thereof, held at the Guildhall, in the said town, the 28th of December, 1812, in pursuance of public notice, given by the mayor, to take into consideration the propriety of petitioning the Prince Regent and both Houses of Parliament, to take such measures as may lead to the RESTORATION OF PEACE,

EDWARD SWANN, Esq. (the mayor,) being called to the chair,

The following Resolutions were unanimously agreed to:—

1st, That it is the opinion of this Meeting, that the alarming and unprecedented decay of the trade of this town and neighbourhood, the destitute and starving condition to which thousands of its inhabitants are reduced, and which imperiously calls for prompt and effectual relief, and the rapid increase and insupportable burden of the poor's rates, are to be attributed to the long continued and ruinous war in which this country is engaged.

2d, That to the same cause are to be ascribed, the general stagnation of Commerce, the alarming augmentation of the public debt, the depreciation of paper currency, the decline of national credit, and the oppressive weight of those burdens which have, in numberless instances, reduced wealth to mediocrity, mediocrity to poverty, and the poor to a state of actual and destructive want.

3d, That it is the opinion of this Meeting that the middle class of society, on whom the burden of the taxes, occasioned by the war, almost wholly falls, is unable to bear the excessive weight of public and parochial taxes, with which it is oppressed, much less to sustain those additions, which we are told by the highest authority must be expected, if the war be still persevered in.

4th, That the industrious and laborious poor, being either wholly or partially deprived of that employment by which they were accustomed to support their families; grain and all other necessaries of life having risen to a price which the best times could not have endured; the immense sums exacted in the form of poor's rates, are found totally insufficient to preserve those from actual want whom they are designed to relieve, while the excessive pressure of rates is constantly reducing others to similar circumstances of distress.

5th, That it is the opinion of this meeting, that peace alone can alleviate the distresses to which this country, and particularly the manufacturing parts of it, are reduced, or avert the still more deplorable ones, which otherwise must be apprehended, and that the voice of patriotism, the voice of humanity, and the precepts of Christianity, equally call on every individual to exert himself according to his ability, to obtain the restoration of that blessing.

6th, That from those considerations, we deem it our duty to present petitions to the Prince Regent and to both Houses of Parliament, praying that such measures may be immediately pursued as shall lead to the attainment of this most desirable and essentially important object.

7th, That the petitions which have now been read, are approved by this meeting, and that they be laid at the Town Hall, for the signatures of those persons who are desirous of contributing to obtain for their country the blessing of peace.

8th, That the petitions to the Prince Regent and to the House of Lords, when signed, be transmitted to the Right Honourable Lord Holland, to be by him duly presented; and that the Petition to the House of Commons, be presented by the members for the town.

9th, That a Committee be now appointed to carry these resolutions into effect, and to procure subscriptions to defray the expenses thereof; and that the following gentlemen do compose such Committe:—Mr. Alderman Allen, Mr. C. L. Morley, Mr. Denison, Mr. F. Hart, Jun. Mr. John Green, Mr. W. F. Rawson, Mr. Huddlestone, Mr. Strachan, and Mr. R. Hopper.

10th, That these resolutions be published in the Nottingham papers, and such of the London papers as the Committee shall direct.

E. SWANN, Chairman.

It was then, on the motion of Robert Denison, Esq. unanimously resolved, That the thanks of this meeting be given to Edward Swann, Esq. the mayor, for his prompt acquiescence in the wishes of the friends of peace, and for his candid and impartial conduct in the chair.

After which, the thanks of the meeting were voted to Robert Denison, Esq. for his exertions on the present, as well as all former similar occasions.

To his Royal Highness the Prince Regent.

Sir,—We, the undersigned, burgesses, or inhabitants of the town, and county of the town of Nottingham, and its precincts, beg leave to claim the attention of your Royal Highness, as being the representative of a sovereign, whose highest glory we presume it is, that he should be considered as the Father of his people; while we dutifully present, before the throne, a statement of the evils from war, experienced by ourselves, and by millions beside of his majesty's vast family: and while we earnestly supplicate, from a paternal regard, so becoming an English monarch, that relief from dire distress, which the speedy restoration of peace alone can be expected to afford.

On that royal power, which was designed to be a blessing and protection to millions, we call for an exertion of Godlike benevolence, which shall speedily terminate a contest, unhappily commenced with precipitancy, and direfully prolonged, by the exasperated passions and the infatuated understandings of men. Many are the motives to peace, and most powerful, which might be expected to influence the mind of your Royal Highness. A respect for the divine principles of Christianity and humanity, it may be hoped, will prevent your Royal Highness from being swayed by the representations of men, whose prejudices, passions, or selfish interests, render them advocates for the *perpetuity of a war*, which, if much longer persisted in, will evidently be accompanied by civil commotion, by famine and by pestilence.

An awful admonition of our having nearly exhausted the resources of the country, is painfully obtruded on our notice by the rapidly increasing beggary and wretchedness of myriads of its industrious and frugal inhabitants, who at no very distant period, enjoyed affluence or competence; and also by the obviously increasing incapacity of our ablest financiers, even while imposing a most oppressive taxation, to devise means for raising supplies in any wise correspondent to the public annual expenditure.

In the largest parish of this once flourishing, but now miserable town, nearly a third part of its population, in consequence of the interruption of trade, is reduced to the state of PAUPERS; and in the other parishes of the town, not less oppressive to those inhabitants on whom a levy can be made, is the *burden of poor's rates*. And we are credibly informed, that a like reduction to beggary and want of multitudes of our countrymen, in the different manufacturing towns of this kingdom, is the consequence of the annihilation of our trade, and of the increase of the taxation produced by war.

Additional to these evils, might be recalled to your Highness's recollection those also, which are inevitable concomitants of the most successful wars, even when waged by nations whose resources may be the most ample, and whose condition the most flourishing.

It assuredly cannot be a matter of little estimation with your Royal Highness, that thousands of brave men should be extended lifeless on the field of battle, that thousands should perish by the hardships of warfare: that there should be thousands of mourning widows and orphan children: that thousands of parents should be hurried to the grave by the loss of beloved sons, who were the support of their declining years: that thousands should die lingering deaths in captivity: and that the majority of the survivors of a long and bloody contest, having, in a course of warfare, experienced interruption to those moral habits, which promote the harmony, comfort and welfare of civil society and of domestic life, should, on the return of a state of peace, be rendered less valuable members of society, and less welcome to the roofs of their relations and friends.

As a speedy restoration of peace alone can mitigate the heavy evils we endure, and save the inhabitants of this land, from impending ruin, and the irrecoverable loss of their once prosperous and enviable condition; as now the ill success and disappointed views of the enemy may lead him to listen more readily to reasonable conditions of peace: we join our afflicted countrymen, in earnestly petitioning your Royal Highness to manifest, by some unequivocal expression or public act of the British government, your truly royal desire to seize the earliest opportunity of sheathing the sword of slaughter, and healing the wounds of a long protracted war: that thus the enemy may be precluded from plausibly throwing the odium of delight in war, and its concommitant miseries on your Royal Highness's pacificatory government.

We will indulge the hope, that your Royal Highness will grant the prayer of our Petition, and that your Highness's endeavours will be effectual in soon restoring to the afflicted people, entrusted to your Royal protection, that lasting peace, after which they so ardently aspire.

Thus may the blessings of the peacemaker descend on your Royal Highness; and thus may your royal father, when called from his present state of sufferings to a better world, be enabled to resign to your Royal Highness, in a state of peace, that throne, which he ascended amid the din of arms, and on which he has continued to sit during so many years of war.

NO POPERY.

Speech of the Rev. John Rowe, at the Bristol No Popery Meeting, Dec. 23, 1812.

Mr. Chairman—I freely acknowledge, that in appearing here this day, I am wholly influenced by a spirit of opposition; for, from the very moment I heard of the measure which has been proposed, I felt my spirit stirred within, and I determined to raise my voice against it, how ineffectual soever that voice might prove—and I determined to move a counteracting resolution, although I should be left to stand here unsupported and alone.

[A stormy discussion here took place, on the question, whether persons who were hostile to the avowed object of the meeting, could deliver their sentiments, consistently with the terms of the requisition:—it was, at length, determined to hear all parties. Mr. Rowe then resumed.—]

I am not, however, and I wish it to be so understood, actuated by a desire of opposing any of the individuals by whom the requisition for the present meeting has been signed; for some of those gentlemen, from my own knowledge of them, I feel personal respect, and for others, from the general estimation in which they are held; but I am incited by duty, to oppose and protest against the object they have in view, because I am satisfied that it is in the highest degree injurious in its tendency to the rights of conscience, to the cause of liberty, civil and religious, to the interests and even the safety of our country, and to the general welfare of mankind.—This meeting purports to be convened by persons, who profess themselves anxious for the preservation of civil and religious liberty, and certainly no anxiety can have an object more legitimate, more dignified, or more sacred: I am far from supposing, that they do not conceive themselves to be so in reality, how much soever I may wish that they better understood the *principles* of liberty, for in that case, they must necessarily have contemplated, what opposition has rendered it, the momentous subject of Catholic emancipation, with views more liberal and enlarged. I have no notion of that attachment to liberty, which leads people to love it too well to part with it. Such an attachment, when money is the object, is marked with the stigma of sordid avarice, and when its object is liberty, it certainly does not deserve the name of generosity, no, nor of justice. I put in my claim, Sir, to be a lover of liberty too, and feeling its value, I enjoy it more abundantly, in proportion as I can sympathize with others, who enjoy it as well as myself. The summons I perceive is addressed to those Protestant inhabitants of Bristol, who feel apprehensive that our liberties are endangered by the Catholic claims. I am here on this very ground. I am apprehensive, tremblingly apprehensive, that our liberties are endangered by them; but then this danger in my opinion, is threatened, not by conceding those claims, but by refusing them. I do not see why the Catholics themselves should not come forward on this occasion, in vindication of their own rights, as men, as Englishmen, and as Christians. Shall not those be reckoned friends of civil and religious liberty, who can best estimate its value by being most denied the exercise of it? I trust, that if there be any of this description present, they will assert their right by voting, and if they think fit, by speaking with the same freedom as the gentlemen themselves, who have signed the requisition. I shall be told, perhaps, that the summons is addressed only to those *Protestants*, who are friendly to the measure proposed. Sir, it is a measure which involves results common to us all, and which must be productive of great good or of great evil to us all. It is designed to influence the legislature, and it therefore becomes the business of those who augur evil from that influence, to endeavour not merely to counteract, but to prevent its operation.—Would not this petition, if it were carried unanimously, be presented as the petition of the inhabitants of Bristol? And shall we, by whom the measure is disapproved and reprobated, be rendered by our absence or by our silence, the instruments of giving to the desired unanimity, a generality which it does not, in reality, possess? Will it not be said, plausibly and triumphantly said, that all the inhabitants of Bristol are for the measure, if none show themselves against it? That we are all to a man apprehensive, that our civil and religious liberties will be "endangered by the concession of the claims made by our Roman Catholic fellow subjects?" They are called even *brethren* in a petition which I have lately seen; and very properly. I wish to regard every Christian as a brother, however he may differ in sentiment from myself. They are very kindly and very endeaingly treated by their opponents, as far as words go, which cost nothing; while, practically, they are to be treated still like Popish enemies.—"Claims, no longer requested as a boon, but demanded as a right." Let me desire attention, for a moment, to this phraseology. Lawyers, I believe, define a claim to be as follows: I therefore infer, that no gentleman in the profession of the law drew up this petition, although it has passed, or seems to have passed under the inspection of several belongings to it, and very able one too—"a claim is the challenge of the ownership or property which one hath not in possession, but from which he is detained wrongfully." How, then, in the nature of things, can a thing be claimed, and requested as a boon or favour at the same time? Where there is no right, there can be no claim; and that from which a man is detained by wrong, he is entitled to demand as a right?—Do you, Sir, or do any of the merchants and traders who have signed the requisition, when you make a claim, consider yourselves as requesting a boon? Aye? but these "claims are not requested as a boon, but demanded as a right, *unconditionally* and without *security*." Sir, it is not so. The Catholics demand, constitutionally demand, their rights, on conditions and on securities, the validity of which no one can reasonably question. Their conditions and securities are security to themselves. Security in the enjoyment of all the inestimable advantages of the BRITISH CONSTITUTION, of which the Catholics, and pre-eminently the Catholics of Ireland, not only profess themselves, but of which they have shown themselves by land and on the seas, the zealous, the intrepid, and the efficient defenders. Trust, then, to their actions, if you will not believe their oaths. And why will you not believe their oaths? Because, it will be said, they hold, "that faith is not to be kept with heretics." Sir, they abjure the doctrine and they reprobate it. Their denial is accredited by their conduct. Are Catholics more disposed to act fraudulently and treacherously in their dealings and social intercourse than others? Are there not Catholics in this city, who rank among the most upright, the most honourable and the most benevolent of its inhabitonts? Do they violate their oaths more notoriously than Protestants? Are there not multiplied oaths among those, the violation of which, to the infamy and the judgment-provoking sin of our nation, is become PROVERBIAL?—If they lay no stress on their oaths, why do the oaths they are required to take, prove to them an insuperable barrier against their *immediate* admission to those privileges which they have been so long, peaceably, legally and perseveringly endeavouring to possess?—It is with oaths as it is with religious tests; they leave the honest man where he is, while the state gains the time-server, the loaf-seeker and the hypocrite. How have the Protestants kept their faith with the Catholics? Was not their emancipation the condition of the Union? Was not Mr. Pitt decided in his opinion, perhaps of the justice, certainly of the expediency, the policy and the necessity of the measure? Did not this memorable, this heaven-born minister, as many call him, but certainly earth-bred, and sadly deteriorated was he, by the gross, corrupted and corrupting elements of this sublunary state,—did not he retire from office, because he could not redeem the pledge which the Catholics had received from him? I wonder that those who were his implicit followers, while he was alive, and who profess so much veneration for his memory, should pay so little deference to his opinion on a point so momentous, now he is dead. That they should pay no regard to the opinion of that much greater man, that true and almost prophetic Statesman, Mr. Fox, I do not wonder.

But then, the Catholics acknowledge the Pope, and "the Pope may release them from their oath of allegiance." Sir, I should not be justified in taking up the time of the meeting in combating phantoms. The throne of the House of Bruswick, or any throne in the present day, to be shaken by a Papal bull!! What if the Catholics acknowledge the Pope as head of their church; can none be good subjects of the King of England, who do not acknowledge him in this capacity? Am I to be accounted disloyal and disaffected on this account? If so, then are some of our Court of Aldermen and Common Council, then are many of the most respectable gentlemen in this hall, then are those anomolous Dissenters who have signed the requisition, and Dissenters in general, for we all acknowledge no lawgiver, no head, no king in the Christian church, but one, that is JESUS CHRIST, to be accounted disloyal and disaffected likewise? Though some acknowledge the Pope to be the head of the church, and others Joanna Southcott, the danger arising from both is the same. The tenets of both are compatible with every security which the state can require.—And after all, what is it that the Catholics do demand? Not to occupy the places which now the Protestants fill. They only ask to be put in a capacity for office, if the head of the executive should see fit to call them to it. It will rest with the king to determine how many, or whether any of them shall enjoy office; and it rests with him, instantly to dismiss them by his sovereign fiat, if being appointed they prove themselves unworthy of their trust.—No doubt, if the Catholics and other Dissenters were put in possession of their privileges, there would be more competitors for office, and this, I verily believe, is one main reason why they are regarded with so much suspicion and jealousy. "Whatever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant, to his own master he standeth or falleth." "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind." Let the Catholic worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, none molesting him or making him afraid God forbid, it will be said, that they should not—this they are allowed to do already. Then why expose them at the same time, to such strong temptations to prevaricate and act contrary to their consciences? Why hold over the heads of Dissenters *in terrorem*, penal statutes, which are a disgrace to our laws, if it be not intended to enforce them? "Innovation," it will be said, "is dangerous." This has been in all ages the plea by which the crafty have deluded the weak. There is negative punishment as well as positive. Is it no punishment to be obliged to wear the mask of suspicion and degradation? Is it no punishment to be incapacitated for the enjoyment of all public honour, public confidence and honourable emolument? The restrictions which are imposed on Dissenters are highly injurious to the minds and the morals of the favoured party themselves. How often do we see one of the privileged order disdainfully pass by another that is excluded, without even returning the usual salutation of gentlemen, though possessing, perhaps, at the same time, no superiority in birth, education, connection, character or usefulness. I expected that our attention would be carried back to the days of bloody Queen Mary. But the gentleman who spoke first on this occasion, has carried us back beyond the reign of her father Henry the Eighth, whom he has called, "that GREAT KING." He was a very great king, for he was very *corpulent*, and very *great* too was he in iniquity; one would hardly have expected to hear him extolled for his zeal for religion, although he was rendered in his day, as, I doubt not, Buonaparte will be, the unwilling instrument of great good, in the hand of Him "who maketh the wrath of man to praise him, and who will restrain the remainder of wrath." His object, in all he did relating to religion, was to gratify his ambition and his lust He held the title, it is true, of Defender of the Faith. When he received this title (from the Pope) he was asked whether it would not be better to leave the faith to defend itself, and for your majesty to discharge your kingly duties? No one can view with greater horror the persecutions in the reign of Mary, than I do. Those who think with me on subjects of religion, had we lived in her time, would have been among the first victims to ignorance and persecution. But in looking back to the days of Queen Mary. let us not overlook those of Elizabeth—let us consider how many Papists were, in her time, persecuted and put to death by Protestants. What has been the conduct of Catholics in later times? There were Catholics, if I mistake not, who accompanied King William, when he came to take possession of the throne. The rebellion in 1745, because it was in favour of a Popish pretender, may be thought to be a Popish rebellion. "The Protestant non-jurors were much more concerned than the Catholics, a great portion of whom offered their services to the crown! Ireland was quiet, and some regiments were sent from thence to assist the Duke of Cumberland."—[Note: the late rebellion in Ireland, Mr. Pitt said repeatedly, was not a religious rebellion.]—Is it fair to argue from the days of Queen Mary to the present? A gentleman has said, that human nature is, in all ages, the same. No doubt human nature is always radically the same; but do not the dispositions of men admit of amelioration, and their conduct of improvement?—Few Protestants, I hope, would be guilty of what Protestants once were; and the lapse of time, in which all things change, has changed the Catholics too. They have benefited by the increase of knowledge and the progress of the human mind, as well as others, and as we do, so do they hold in abhorrence the atrocities of our forefathers.

I wish the advocates of the petition would promote unanimity by withdrawing it, rather than provoke the discord which either the adoption or the rejection of it must occasion. I wish them to pause before they attempt to carry a measure, so portentous, a measure pregnant with such calamitous results. Have we not wars enough already? Will not a new enemy in America satisfy? Must we have disunion occasioned, and dissatisfaction excited among ourselves? I do not say, nor do I think, that it is the design of the opponents of Catholic emancipation to goad the Irish to disaffection: but "blind" must they be, "and not able to see afar off," who do not see that it is the *direct tendency* of the measures they are pursuing. It is a maxim of Apostolic authority, "not to do evil that good may come," but the denial of the Catholic claims is an evil from which no good can come; and if they be refused, the time, I fear, will arrive, when we shall be forced to surrender what we now refuse to concede. If, Sir, the petition must be presented, I rejoice that our late unsuccessful, but notwithstanding *triumphant* candidate, Sir Samuel Romilly—(I apply no epithets to a name which contains in itself eminence in greatness, in integrity, in disinterestedness, and as far as I know, in every virtue that can reflect dignity on the human character)—I rejoice that Sir S. Romilly is not to be subjected to the mortification and the humiliation of presenting it. Our opponents will rejoice also, that it will be placed in *better hands.* The unanimity I have expressed a desire to see preserved, I do not, of course, mean to disturb, by proposing a counter petition, or any counter resolution. I shall simply move that this meeting do now adjourn.

Speech intended to have been spoken at the Bristol Meeting, by the Rev. Dr. Estlin.

Permit me, Sir, in addition to the important principles which have been advanced, to call your attention, for a short time, to a few principles of a more general nature, which appear to me to bear directly on the subject before us. We have heard a great deal of the *Doctrines* of the Roman Catholics, and of their dangerous tendency. Sir, we are not met here for the discussion of points of theology, and we shall proceed without our guide if we do not set out with distinguishing between the *Principles* of the Catholics, and the *Cause* of the Catholics. It is a singular fact, that of the persons who advocate their *cause*, none are more zealous than those who are the farthest removed from them in *principle;* at the same time, their most active opponents are those who have embraced the same general doctrines, adopted the same creeds, and taken from them the greater part of their liturgy. This, Sir, can only arise from that strong bond of union, actual or supposed oppression. The friends of religious liberty, though they may be parted by subjects of controversy, and may go, one towards the east, and another towards the west, will, at the distance of a hundred and eighty degrees, meet in friendly union, and return hand in hand together. Sir, I remember, at Paris, in the year 1789, a gentleman of Cambridge, in company with the Abbe Kearney, at that time I think the head of the Irish Seminary, and myself, was speaking with something like an assumed superiority of importance, of the Church of which he was a member; when the learned and liberal Divine said to him with perfect good humour, "You must take care what you say, Sir: Mr. Estlin and I differ in opinion, and we agree to differ; but if you attack *me*, you must borrow his weapons, and if you attack *him*, you must be obliged to me for mine." Sir, I give the gentlemen present credit for the purest intentions possible; I believe they are possessed of piety of spirit, and a tolerant disposition, and that no unkind or unfriendly intention is the cause of their present opposition. Our difference is a difference of opinion.

Sir, of the *tendency* of religious opinions, no one can judge for another. If some men are *worse* than their principles, others are *better.* There is, if I may so express myself, an *amiable inconsistency* in the human mind. The heart often rectifies the mistakes of the head, and the *conduct* of those who *profess* opinions which appear intolerant, is often a reflection on those who make professions of greater liberality. I fear, as Christians, *we all* fall short of our standard.

Sir, to charge a person with holding opinions which he does *not* hold, to expose a person to privations and degradations most painful to a mind of conscious dignity, for holding opinions which he detests, abhors, abjures, and which are proved, by the unanimous voice of the Universities with which he is connected, to constitute no part of his system of faith, is a conduct of which I look in vain for a proper term of reprobation.

Sir, in past times, when the true spirit of the Gospel was little known, and men's attention was directed almost exclusively to articles of faith, and not to rules of duty, we have seen in many melancholy instances, what a narrow, selfish, excluding, and suspicious policy can effect. In this age of superior light, let us shew the world what may be effected by a liberal, expansive, comprehensive, fraternal Christian policy. I am inclined to think, with an ancient philosopher, that of all the objects of fear, no one is more to be dreaded than the passion of fear itself.

If the Catholics of Ireland be the dangerous persons they are supposed by some to be, let us try what may be done with them by kindness. As affection is the key to the human heart, let us endeavour to open it by that. In this figurative scriptural sense, let us "heap coals of fire on their head."

Sir, it would be time enough to do what is now doing in this country, if every restriction were removed, and the Crown were actually advised to fill up the principal offices of state, both civil and military, with Roman Catholics. To the mere *eligibility* of such persons, I see no grounds for the operation of fear itself.

Sir, to come directly to the point before us, *the first, the most sacred duty of man, is to worship his Maker in sincerity*. I say, *in sincerity*, for if worship be *not* sincere, if it be not the language of the heart, it is *not worship:* it is simulation, it is hypocrisy; it is that specific crime for which, in the first age of the Church, two persons were stricken dead, that they might be a warning to all succeeding ages; it is "lying, not unto men, but unto God." This first duty of man is sanctioned by the positive command of Christ: "God," says he, "is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."

Sir, Duties and Rights are reciprocal. Where a Duty lies on one person, a Right necessarily exists in another. The Duty of worshipping his Maker in sincerity is the duty of man; the Right to receive this worship is the right of God. Sir, if these last words are to be found in a writer in whom little that is good is to be found, and whom I was one of the first to answer, they are not taken from him. I had *used* them, and in opposition to every early prejudice, and to those hopes which are a powerful stimulus to a young and ardent mind, I had *acted* upon them many years before "The Age of Reason" was written.

Sir, I am sensible that the following sentiment has not occurred, or does not appear with sufficient evidence, to others; of the truth of it I entertain no doubt. To subject a person to any inconvenience whatever, whether positive or negative, for worshipping his Maker in sincerity, is to attempt to seduce him from his duty to God and his allegiance to Christ; and the infringement of the right is an infringement of the right, not of man but of God. Let it not be forgotten that I impute this to no man, or body of men, least of all to the present opposers of the Catholic claims, who, I believe, are actuated by the purest principles. I am speaking (and let this distinction never be lost sight of) not of *men*, but of *things*.

Sir, not to molest a man in the worship of his Maker is *toleration*; but to subject him to any inconvenience afterwards, seems not to merit that appellation. It is certainly a species of persecution, nor can the degree of it change its nature. Whatever be the degree of it, it is persecution still.

Sir, that toleration is the character of the present age, is its glorious distinction from preceding ages. But the light which now dawns, when it comes to perfect day, will, I trust, render the primitive word toleration, with all its derivatives, a dead language. The period, I trust, is approaching, when we shall cease to talk of tolerating man in his duty, and God in his rights. The word *rights* has been too much used and improperly applied. Happy will be the state of the world when every one will think of *his own duty*, and the *rights* of others, and not of *his own rights*, and the *duty* of others.

Sir, from the causes which are now operating, and particularly the extensive circulation of the Bible, I have formed the most sanguine expectations. The period, I trust, is not so remote as it is generally thought to be, when the person who at present calls himself a Catholic will acknowledge that Christ is the only king in his kingdom, the only head and lawgiver in his Church—when the Member of the Church of England, in consistency with his professed principles, will substitute the Bible in the room of his creeds and articles, acknowledging with the Champion of Protestantism, that "the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants;" and finally, when the Dissenter, finding his ground of non-conformity narrowed, will embrace both Catholic and Churchman as brethren, and when, every other name being absorbed in the name, the blessed name, which was first given at Antioch, all contention will cease, except the contention who shall most nearly resemble his Master, and by his piety to God and benevolence to man, most adorn the religious principles he professes.

Sir, with these views, which are not taken up hastily, but are the result of many years consideration, I am compelled, from principles of conscience, with sentiments of personal respect, to vote for the adjournment of this meeting, by your leaving the chair.

Counter Petition from Bristol.

To the Right Hon. the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of the Protestant Inhabitants of the City of Bristol, whose names are hereunto subscribed,

SHEWETH,

That your petitioners are firm friends to religious toleration, being fully persuaded that no power on earth has any right to interfere with the dictates of conscience, with respect either to doctrine or worship; except only in cases which affect the plain obligations of morality, or the peace and safety of society.

That being deeply and conscientiously impressed with these sentiments, and not anticipating that the plain obligations of morality, or the peace and safety of society would be, in the remotest degree, endangered by the concession of the Catholic claims, they should feel that they were acting a very inconsistent part, if they did not express their regret at the continuance of those restrictions to which their Catholic fellow subjects are exposed on account of their religious profession.

That your petitioners, with humble deference to your right honourable house, beg leave to state, that they are too sensible of the high privileges of the British constitution not to wish them as widely diffused as possible; while therefore their hearts dilate with gratitude to God, that they and their Protestant brethren through the United Kingdom have been so highly favoured, they wish that these blessings should be equally extended to all their fellow subjects, and that the state should no longer be deprived of those essential advantages which they confidently anticipate that it would derive, from the equal eligibility of members of all religious persuasions to places of trust and honour.

That your petitioners likewise recollect, that upon a late occasion, a large majority of their own number were called upon, previously to the exercise of their elective franchise, to take the oath of supremacy, which, although it be in no wise repugnant to their own sentiments, necessarily excluded from a similar exercise a large body of respectable and virtuous citizens; and that as in Ireland it has been found that the elective franchise can be extended without danger to those whose religious principles forbid them from taking the oath alluded to, they would submit to your lordships' wisdom, whether a similar indulgence might not be safely extended here also.

That your petitioners cannot, on the present occasion, forbear from expressing in the strongest terms their detestation and abhorrence of all intolerance and persecution, and of course, of the intolerant spirit which disgraced Catholicism in former ages; but as this spirit has been strongly reprobated by Catholics of the present day, and your petitioners look upon it as the vice of the age rather than of the sect, and as they cannot review the conduct of the Protestant churches, at the same period, without feelings of shame and regret, they deem it the more Christian part to bury such transactions in the oblivion which ought to overwhelm them; lest, by reviving the recollection of scenes so atrocious, religious animosity should be rekindled, and the subjects of the same United Empire be rendered hostile to each other.

On these grounds, and others with which it would be tedious and unbecoming to trouble your lordships, your petitioners humbly pray, that your lordships in your wisdom will be pleased to extend to every class of the community, whatever be their religious faith, the equal enjoyment of the privileges of the British

Constitution. By such an extension of those privileges, they should feel their own rights more secure; for they are fully convinced, that by this enlightened policy the hearts of all the inhabitants of this favoured country would be knit together as the heart of one man, and would present a barrier equally impregnable against foreign hostility and domestic dissention.—And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

Freedom of religion and freedom of trade, have been the great objects of public discussion since our last; the former, excited by the petitions of the Roman Catholics for emancipation, and the petitions of the Protestant Catholics to resist it,—the latter from the expected application of the East India Company, for the renewal of their charter, which has excited applications from different parts of England, to participate in their trade. The Roman Catholics have put the No Popery party on the alert, and it must be confessed, that they have manifested no small diligence and assiduity in their opposition. They have had a difficult task to perform; for the point was to excite a strong opposition throughout the kingdom, and raise a cry of the danger of the church, so as not to burst into riots and tumults, and renew the conflagrations and dangers of the year 1780.

The plan was exceedingly well laid, and the execution of it, to a certain point very successful. The clergy were set in motion in their cathedral and collegiate churches, archdeaconries and rural deaneries. Numerous petitions were gained from these bodies, though in the two Universities they were not carried without great opposition. The laity, as they are called, were then to be worked upon, and this not by open and public meetings, but by personal applications from house to house, or printed papers left at each house, pointing out where a petition might be signed. Several of these papers have passed under our notice, but the effect of a personal application, in a principal city, as described by a worthy shopkeeper, merits insertion, and we shall give it in his own words, though they were not intended for the public eye.

"We have had a great deal of intrigue, in getting persons to sign a petition against the Catholics, not by means of a public meeting, but by the clergy, who have each gone round, attended by several persons of the most influence in their respective parishes, soliciting persons to put down their names; I had them in my shop, but none of us signed it. I refused from principle; as, though an unworthy follower of the Christian religion, I think those who wish to exclude their fellow-subjects from an equal participation of the benefits of a government, instituted for the good of all, owing to their different modes of obtaining salvation, act not like Christians, but like barbarians; as according to my ideas of this subject, the great vital principle of the Christian religion, is universal philanthropy. Would, that the clergy of all denominations might unite, in enforcing the necessity of this principle, instead of dwelling for ever upon particular points, which, as the learned have never agreed upon, must, necessarily be beyond the reach of the understanding of those whose lot it is to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow."

By the above-mentioned plan, it is evident, that a very good estimate might be made by those, who were the leaders in it, of the strength of their party, and it was intended to give a decisive proof of it by applications to Parliament, from large cities, towns and counties. But here their operations failed, and it is here that the nation may be congratulated, on the change of the public mind, from what it was in the time of Sacheverell and Lord George Gordon. The attempt on the counties was baffled by the reception they met with in three of them, Cornwall, Wiltshire and Kent. In Cornwall was such a scene of confusion in the public meeting, that nothing was there gained by the religious monopolists; in Wiltshire they thought themselves secure, and having their requisition strongly signed, had no doubt of a very great triumph; but on the day of meeting, they were completely beat out of the field, both by argument and numbers. The discussion was long, and in it they took, as was natural, the lead: but every topic urged by them for intolerance, was met by a union of eloquence and reasoning, that was irresistible, and of those who came with the fullest determination to follow their leaders, and vote against religious liberty, great numbers held up their hands in favour of it. The debate ended in the throwing out of the petition introduced by the monopolists, and the adoption of another in favour of religious liberty, and the votes for the latter were about seven to one more than those of the former.

In Kent the religious monopolists were more successful, yet even that success was attended with such circumstances, as made them dread the concussion of public opinion. A considerable discussion there took place, and the numbers were so near equality, that the question was twice put: but the majority, an evidently trifling one, was in their favour. In Flintshire, we believe, they carried the day almost without opposition, but in the few towns they attempted any thing, they excited counter petitions, and so lost the effect. It is extraordinary, that in the two metropolitan cities of Canterbury and York, they could not take the field, though in the former they borrowed the Guildhall, of the mayor, for the use of the clergy and neighbouring gentry. In such a meeting, every thing was carried as might naturally be expected; those country squires only attended, who were either tenants of the church, or existed in habits of social intercourse with the numerous body of parsons in such a place; the rest did not choose to attend a meeting, where the clergy necessarily had such a preponderance.

For a long time the question might be said to have been kept out of London, but, at last, an effort was made there, by meetings in several parishes and petitions, to the signing of which the inhabitants were invited by the minister and church-wardens. A meeting was also first held at a tavern, of merchants and traders, which led to a petition from several persons living in the city; and afterwards a society was formed under the name of the Protestant Union, at the head of which appeared the venerable name of Granville Sharpe. When we mention that name, every one will recognize the zealous assertor of the rights of humanity, as far as respects the persons of men, and his services in asserting the liberty of every man, black or white, on English ground; and his labours in the abolition of the slave trade, will for ever endear him to our hearts. We lament, that his views should not have been more extended; that born within the pale of the predominant sect he cannot feel for those without it, and see that civil restraints on account of religion are as contrary to good policy as they are to the religion of Christ. But it must be said in favour of this worthy gentleman, that he is a monopolist from principle, and he would not desire success, unless he thought it to be founded on argument. In consequence of this just opinion, his society has issued a manifesto, in which the question on his side is well maintained, and with that and an admirable paper written by Mr. Butler, the learned Catholic, our readers may be in possession of every thing that can be said on both sides. The Protestant Union falls into the usual error of imputing to the present Catholics, every thing that can be raked against the religion of our ancestors out of the dark ages; not recollecting that if the Church of England is to be tried in the same manner, she must be given up by every honest mind, as it is not two hundred years ago, since she burnt publicly in the flames, men for differing from her in her creed.

The agitation of this question is of very great importance, it is a searcher of hearts. If the minds of men have been made known by it, and we have reason to rejoice at the increase of liberality, still it may be doubted, whether, in this improvement, the

Church does not excel the Dissenters, for, we are sorry to say, that the monopolists boast of having the signatures of many Dissenting ministers to their petitions. The Dissenting ministers in and about London, are freed from this reproach, as they have unanimously agreed to a petition to Parliament for universal freedom in religion. The Deputies of the Dissenters will have met before this meets the reader's eye; and there is some reason to expect that the opinion of the Methodists will be brought forward. Of this very numerous and very respectable class of Christians, many entertain the most liberal opinions, designing nothing for themselves, that they would not grant to others, and considering, that the kingdom of Christ is not meat and drink, is not exclusive privilege for one sect or party, but universal benevolence.

Before the legislature, however, the petitions against religious liberty, far outweigh those in favour of it: though, if the circumstances are duly taken into consideration, the sense of the United Kingdom can be by no means gathered from them, or rather, the presumption is against them. The petitions against liberty are, in general, of the sect established by law, instigated chiefly by their clergy, whose influence, from their property and situation in life, is very considerable; but still, of that sect a very small proportion has taken part either way. With respect to the other sects, numbers have been kept back, from a consideration, that this is a partial application, and having no more regard for the Roman Catholics than the English church, they hardly interest themselves in the debate. Among the Irish the question is full of party feuds; both parties having too much reason to accuse each other of outrages, disgraceful to the name and character of the Christian.

Whilst this Protestant country has been thus agitated by a dispute on a subject, on which the rest of Europe is at peace, and where Catholics have consented to admit Protestants to all civil rights, the situation of the Pope, the great bugbear in this island, becomes an object of attention. After having been kept for many years a prisoner in an Italian fortress, the old man was brought to Fontainbleau, and lodged in the palace, and treated with high honours. The turn in the fortune of Buonaparte has been of great use to him, for the matters in dispute between them have been brought to a conclusion, and the peace of the church is settled by a new Concordat. By this agreement the Pope's spiritual supremacy is acknowledged, and he is allowed to receive and send ambassadors and legates; and to enjoy his estate in Italy free of taxes, but he must institute every bishop and archbishop within six months after the emperor's nomination, and on non-compliance, the office is to be performed by the senior bishop in the diocese. The Pope has the nomination of ten bishoprics in Italy or France, to be settled by mutual convention, and the six suburb bishoprics at Rome. The power of giving bishoprics *in partibus* remains in the Pope, but all civil power is taken from him. Thus this object of ancient dread is reduced much to the situation of the spiritual sovereign in Japan, or rather to a state somewhat superior to our archbishop of Canterbury. His income is much greater, and his patronage richer; but when we compare his present state with that of his predecessors, it is a fall that must be sensibly felt, and is a presage, we humbly hope, of the approaching dissolution of this anti-christian power.

The question on commercial freedom interests a very large body of men. Hindoostan presents to the historian an appearance which cannot be paralleled by any thing in the annals of mankind; an immense territory held by a few subjects of another kingdom, whose dominion may at a precise moment be dissolved. They hold it by a charter, exactly in the same manner as a tenant holds his land by lease from his landlord; when the lease expires, the land returns to the sole occupancy of the owner, and when the charter expires, the dominion belongs to the crown of Britain. The charter expires within three years, and the question is, whether it shall be renewed and upon what terms. The latter have excited very great discussions, both in and out of the East India Company, and are of a nature to produce animated debates in Parliament.

The East India Company has under its present charter territorial dominion in India, and an exclusive trade to all countries to the east of the Cape of Good Hope. The latter will not be allowed to the present extent, for why should an Englishman be debarred from trading with Madagascar, the east coast of

Africa, Arabia and Persia, with which countries the East India Company has little or no intercourse; but it contends very earnestly for the exclusive trade to China, and to this there seems a disposition to accede. If the East India Company remains in possession of that exclusive trade to China we must remain in ignorance of the vast empire of China; for a company will never act with that spirit which belongs to private merchants, and if Englishmen in general had had access to Canton for the same number of years as the Company, it is probable that at this time the Chinese language would have been very well known in this country. Restrictions respecting China and Hindoostan may be expected, should a new charter be granted; but it is not impossible that the government may take into its own hands, what seems to belong more peculiarly to its jurisdiction than to that of a commercial company.

It is natural that in a question of this kind, where the parties interested on one side only deliver their opinions, unanimity should prevail, and this was nearly the case in the East India House. One person, however, differed from the body, and his opinions are of more weight, we might almost say, than that of the majority, at any rate they deserve the utmost consideration from the other party in the agreement. But there are several parties in this great question: the government and the East India Company; the outports and the City of London. The discussion between the former involves the rights of sovereignty over an immense country, and also the advantages of opening a great trade to the United Kingdom. The second involves the question of confining or not an immense trade to a single port, and that the port of London. Petitions are prepared and sent to Parliament from the out-ports for a participation in the trade, but this is resisted by the port of London. Here, as is natural, they who are interested in exclusive advantages, will not be at a loss for arguments to support their claims; but London has sufficient advantages in itself, of which it can never be deprived, and to throw more into its scale is an evident injury to the United Kingdom. The Parliament will have to decide upon questions, singular in their nature, difficult in the extreme, and requiring profound judgment and the utmost impartiality and integrity.

A very delicate question of a different nature occupies the public mind, and it is brought before us by a letter addressed by the Princess Regent to her royal consort. These high parties have lived for some years in a state of separation, and their daughter, now approaching to womanhood, is naturally an object of solicitude to the mother. Some difficulties have occurred in the intercourse between the mother and child, and as charges had been made some years ago respecting the former, which had undergone an investigation, but never been made public, curiosity has been on float to know their precise nature. The Princess challenges inquiry; whethert will take place time will shew, but we must lament that any thing should have occurred to injure the peace of a family in which the nation is so much interested.

But important as all these questions are, they lose their interest when compared with the stupendous matters in agitation on the continent. All eyes have been fixed on France, on the manner in which she would receive the extraordinary character at the head of her government, after the calamitous reverse in his fortune. At first, confusion was expected, but the sudden appearance of the sovereign in his capital seems to have broken every measure that might have had in view the abolition of his power. He appeared undaunted, and the moment he returned, set himself in earnest to restore his shattered fortunes. France also united with him, and his proposition of an immediate army, what by conscription, what by gift from several cities and towns, has been received apparently without a murmur. To sanction every thing, he has called together his legislative body, before whom he appeared in all the pomp of majesty, and delivered a speech, the evident produce of his great and unconquered mind.

Here is no disguise of the mortification he had experienced in the baffling of his measures and the destruction of his army. Upon this he says, "the excessive and premature rigour of the winter brought down a heavy calamity. In a few nights I saw every thing change: I experienced the heaviest losses. They would have broken my heart, if, in these awful circumstances, I could have been accessible to any other sentiments than those of the interest, the glory and the prosperity of my people." England, of course, has the usual share of obloquy thrown out upon its conduct, but all his allies are complimented on their fidelity. His misfortunes, he boasts, have made "apparent, in all their extent, the grandeur and the solidity of his empire, founded upon the efforts and the love of fifty millions of citizens, and upon the territorial resources of one of the finest countries in the world." Peace is declared to be his wish; but it is to be conformable to the grandeur of his empire: and what is the most wonderful thing in this address is its conclusion, that he shall not impose any new burthen upon his people. In this we shall be glad to see him imitated in this kingdom; but from the tenor of the Speech we augur only the continuance of those calamities by which Europe has been so long afflicted. When will mankind be brought to a sense of their duty and by a life consistent with reason and religion, avert the just judgment of God on their sins.

The distresses of France have not produced the favourable results that might have been expected in Spain The French are as likely as ever to retain the possession of that country; though, if they are to be driven out, Lord Wellington has gained those powers which will enable him to employ his strength to greater advantage. Buonaparte is determined to keep what he has gained: and unless the Spaniards act for themselves, it is to little purpose that the blood of the English is shed in the conflict. One advantage has been gained in the dilatory Cortez. The Inquisition, that disgrace to their country, appears likely to be abolished. The question has been taken up, and they divided in the proportion of three to two in favour of the abolition of that horrid tribunal. We have never disguised our sentiments, that we would rather see the Peninsula in the possession of the French, than that man should be permitted to exercise upon man those barbarities by which that tribunal is distinguished, which degraded the mind of the Spaniard, and rendered him unworthy, as long as he clinged to so infamous an institution, of the support of any rational being.

In the north of Europe, the Russians seem to have made but little progress. Their armies have probably suffered so much, that they find it difficult to advance, and the French have sufficient strength to make a formidable stand in Poland and West Prussia. The sovereign of the latter country is reduced to a most miserable state. His army may be said to have revolted from him, and to hold one part of his dominions, whilst he is carried by the French to another, where, in fact, with all the ensigns of royalty, he is only a state prisoner. Sweden has published a long manifesto on the wrongs it has received from France. Russia has not had the courage to declare Poland an independent kingdom, and the Emperor of Austria is expected at Mayence, there to settle new schemes and to add his sanction to that of the Pope's to the approaching coronation of the Empress of the French and the young King of Rome; a fete which is to satisfy France for all its losses.

Hopes of peace with America seem to be languid. The former President is re-elected, and parliament here has had a discussion on the war, in which great unanimity prevailed on the justice of it War is an evil of so tremendous a nature so abhorrent to the character of man, so completely contemptible in itself, that it requires much stronger argument, than we have read in support of it. At any rate, we could wish, that the lovers of Peace would exercise as great powers of mind in the pursuit of that object, which is the true test of men being of the Christian religion.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The reader will again observe omissions in our several departments, but he will see also that we have once more exceeded our usual number of pages.

We have great pleasure in answering the various inquiries that have been sent to us concerning the Meetings of the Ministers of the Three Denominations and the Deputies. The Ministers met on the day appointed and unanimously passed the same Resolutions and agreed to the same Petition as last year: both, it will be recollected, assert the universal, inalienable right to full religious liberty. The Deputies, on the motion of Mr. Rutt, resolved, in a full meeting, Tuesday, the 23d inst. by a majority of 54 to 25, to petition Parliament immediately for "the Repeal of all Statutes, inflicting penalties or disabilities on the ground of religious profession."

Various Communications have been received from the Rev. F. Stone, who desires to make his acknowledgments to *Anonymous*.

Erratum.—P. 14, 1st col. 2d line from the bottom, for *latis* read *fatis*.

THE

MONTHLY REPOSITORY

OF

Theology and General Literature.

No. LXXXVII. MARCH. [Vol. VIII.

AN ADDRESS* TO THE PROTESTANTS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND. BY CHARLES BUTLER, ESQ. OF LINCOLN'S INN.

In the last sessions of Parliament, the House of Commons came to a resolution, that "the House would, early in the next session, take into its most serious consideration the laws affecting his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Great Britain and Ireland, with a view to such final, conciliatory adjustment, as might be conducive to the peace of the United Kingdom, stability of the Protestant Establishment, and the general satisfaction and concord of all classes of his majesty's subjects." Encouraged by this resolution, the Roman Catholics of England and Ireland intend presenting immediately separate petitions to each House of Parliament, "for a repeal of the penal and disabling statutes, which still remain in force against them." In the mean time, they observe with great concern and surprize, that attempts are made to prejudice the legislature against their application. Many erroneous, artful and inflammatory publications of this tendency have been actively and extensively circulated. The charges brought in them against the Roman Catholics, are of the most serious nature. The object of this Address to you, is to answer these charges, and to state to you, succinctly, the grounds of the intended application of the English Roman Catholics to the legislature for relief. The greatest part of what is intended to be said in the Address, will apply, in great measure, as much to the situation of the Irish and Scottish, as to the situation of the English Roman Catholics: but as the penal codes of Ireland, Scotland and England, in respect to Roman Catholics, are very different, it has been thought advisable to confine the present Address to the case of the English Roman Catholics only.

I.—It is generally represented in the publications of which we complain, that the English Roman Catholics *labour under no real grievances;* and that, if all the remaining penal laws against them were repealed, *the number of those, who would be really benefited by the repeal, would be too insignifi-*

---

* We are moved by the excellence and importance of Mr. Butler's Address to give it a permanent place in our Repository, and we place it in the front of the present number that nothing may break in upon our design of giving it entire this month. ED.

cant to make their relief an object of legislative concern. But this representation is altogether erroneous—the English Catholics labour under many severe penalties and disabilities: their whole body is affected by them, and would be essentially benefited by their removal.

1st. By the 13th Charles 2d, commonly called the Corporation Act, their whole body is excluded from offices in cities and corporations.—2d. By the 25th Charles 2d, commonly called the Test Act, their whole body is excluded from civil and military offices.—How injurious these Acts are, both to the public and to the individuals on whom they operate, appeared in 1795; in which year, during the then great national alarm of invasion, Lord Petre, the grandfather of the present Lord, having, with the express leave and encouragement of Government, raised, equipped and trained, at his own expence, a corps of 250 men for his majesty's service, requested that his son might be appointed to the command of them. His son's religion was objected, his appointment was refused, and another person was appointed to the command of the corps. You cannot but feel how such a conduct tended to discourage the Catholics from exertions of zeal and loyalty. But the noble family had too much real love of their country to resile from her service, even under these circumstances. His Lordship delivered over the corps, completely equipped and completely trained, into the hands of Government, and his son served in the ranks. Surely you cannot think that laws, which thus tend to alienate the hearts, and paralyze the exertions of those who, in the hour of danger, thus wished to serve their country, are either just or wise.—3d. By the 7th and 8th of William 3d, ch. 27. Roman Catholics are liable to be prevented from voting at elections.—4th. By the 30th Car. 2d. § 2. c. 1. Roman Catholic Peers are prevented from filling their hereditary seats in Parliament.—5th. By the same Statute, Roman Catholics are prevented from sitting in the House of Commons.—6th. By several Statutes, Roman Catholics are disabled from presenting to advowsons, a legal incident of property, which the law allows even to the Jew.—7th. Though a considerable proportion of his majesty's fleets and armies is Roman Catholic, not only no provision is made for the religious comforts and duties of Roman Catholic soldiers and sailors, but, by the Articles of War, they are liable to the very heaviest pains and penalties for refusing to join in those acts of outward conformity to the religious rites of the Established Church, which a Roman Catholic considers to amount to a dereliction of his faith. By the Articles of War, sect. 1. a soldier absenting himself from divine service and sermon, is liable, for the first offence, to forfeit 12d. and for the second, and every other offence, to forfeit 12d. and to be put in irons. By the same Articles, sect. 2. art. 5. "If he shall disobey any lawful command of his superior" (and, of course, if he shall disobey any lawful commands of his superior officer to attend divine service and sermon) "he shall suffer death, or such other punishment as by a general court-martial shall be awarded."—In the last Parliament, it was shewn, that a meritorious private, for refusing, (which he did in the most respectful manner) to attend divine service and sermon according to the rites of the Established Church, was confined nine days in a dungeon, on bread and water.—The Roman Catholics acknowledge with gratitude, the virtual suspension of these laws, in consequence of the orders recently issued by his Royal Highness the present Commander in Chief, and the facilities which they afford for enabling the Roman Catholic soldiers to attend their own religious worship; but they beg leave to observe, that these humane regulations still want the firm sanction of law, and therefore, to a certain extent, are still precarious; and are not *always* attended to.—8th. In common with the rest of his Majesty's subjects, the Roman Catholics contribute to the religious establishment of the country; they have also to support their own religious functionaries; and thus have a double religious establishment to defray. Of this, however, they do not complain; but they think it a serious grievance that their own religious endowments are not legalized like those of the Protestant Dissenters.—In hospitals, workhouses and other public institutions, the attendance of the ministers of their own communion is sometimes denied to the poor of the Roman Catholic religion, and the children of the Roman Catholic poor are sometimes forced into Protestant schools, under the eyes of their parents.

II.—Such, fellow subjects, is the particular operation of the principal laws still remaining in force against your English Catholic brethren.—The *general effect* of them is, to depress every member of the body below his legitimate level in society.—Even in the very lowest order of the community, some situations conferring comfort, emolument, or distinction, are open to the individuals of that class, and in proportion as the several classes of society rise into importance, these situations are multiplied. From all of them the law excludes the English Catholic. This effectually places him below his Protestant brethren of the same class, and makes the whole body in the estimation of the community, a depressed and insulated cast.—This the Roman Catholics severely feel; but it is not by its substantial effects alone that they feel their depression. Some avenues of wealth are still open to them—none to honours or distinctions. Thus, thousands of those possibilities, the prospect and hope of which constitute a large proportion of the general stock of human happiness, are peremptorily denied to the Roman Catholics. No hope of provision, of preferment, of honours or dignity, cheers their souls or excites their exertions. A Roman Catholic scarce steps into life, when he is made to feel that nothing which confers them is open to him; and however successful his career may have been, it seldom happens that his success has not been, on more than one occasion, either lessened or retarded by the circumstance of his having been a Roman Catholic.—Here then our Protestant countrymen are called upon to place themselves in our situation; and to reflect what their own feelings would be, if, from a conscientious adherence to their religious principles, they belonged to a class thus legally degraded. How often would they substantially feel the effects of this degradation? How many of their hopes would it destroy? How many of their projects would it ruin? Surely a petition to the legislature, from any portion of his majesty's subjects, for the removal of such a woe, is entitled to the sympathy and aid of every other portion of the community.

III. We are sometimes told, that *however the repeal of the laws complained of by the Roman Catholics would benefit them, it would confer no real benefit on the state;* and that, as no alteration of law should take place, unless it promotes the general welfare of the state, the laws complained of should remain in force.—But we beg leave to submit to the consideration of our countrymen, that the whole kingdom would be essentially served by the repeal of the penal laws remaining in force against his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects. On this head, the writer of these pages requests your particular attention.—Two-thirds of the population of Ireland, and no inconsiderable proportion of the population of England is composed of Roman Catholics. It is obvious that the feelings of this large proportion of the community are wounded, in the highest degree, by the penal and disabling laws to which they are subject; and that they consider themselves highly injured, insulted and degraded by them. Now, must it not be beneficial to the state, that this extensive feeling of insult, injury and degradation, should be healed? Do not wisdom and sound policy make it the interest of the state, that every circumstance which leads this injured, insulted and degraded, but numerous portion of the community, to think that any new order of things must end their injury, insult and degradation, and is, therefore desirable, should be removed as soon as possible? Surely the removal of it must be as advantageous to the state, as it will be advantageous and gratifying to the persons individually benefited by it. But this is not the only circumstance which would make the repeal of the penal laws a general benefit to the state. Again, we request you to consider the immense number of his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, and the great proportion which it bears to the rest of the community. What a proportion of genius, of talent, of energy, of every thing else, by which individuals are enabled to distinguish themselves, and benefit and elevate their country must fall, to their share!—But all this, for the present, is lost to you, in consequence of the penal codes. Is the subtraction of this prodigious mass of probable genius, talent and wisdom, from the general stock, no detriment to the state? Surely it is a national loss. Thus, while the penal code harrasses the individual object of its infliction, it contracts and paralyzes, to an amazing degree, the strength, powers and energies of the whole community.

IV.—It is alleged, *that the Roman Catholics of this kingdom enjoy the most full and liberal toleration; and that toleration is the utmost favour, to which any nonconformist to the religion es-*

tablished by law can reasonably aspire. To this, we beg leave to answer, that toleration, rightly understood, is all we ask for by our petition. But what is toleration, when the word is rightly understood? If, after a government has adopted a particular religion, decreed its mode of worship to be observed in its churches, and provided for its functionaries, from the funds of the state, it leaves the nonconformist in complete possession of all his civil rights and liberties, the nonconformist enjoys a full and complete toleration. But whenever the government of a country represses other forms of religion, by subjecting those who profess them, to any deprivation or abridgment of civil right or liberty, toleration is at an end and persecution begins. This is too plain a position to admit of contradiction: the only question, therefore, is, Whether the pains and penalties to which the Roman Catholics are still subject, by the laws in force against them, deprive them of any civil right or liberty?—To meet this question fully, I shall consider how far the Corporation Act, which excludes us from corporations, and the Test Act, which excludes us from civil and military offices, can be justly said to deprive us of a civil right. I prefer placing the question on these Acts, because by their own confession, it is the strongest hold of our adversaries, and because, in the discussion of that question, thus propounded, I shall advocate the cause of the Protestant Dissenters as much as our own.—Our common adversaries contend, that the exclusion of nonconformists, by the Test and Corporation Acts, from honourable and lucrative offices, is not a punishment, and therefore is not intolerance.—But, before the enactment of those statutes, were not all the subjects of this realm, equally eligible, by the common law of the land, to every honourable and every lucrative office which the state could confer? Is not eligibility to office a civil right? Does it not, therefore, necessarily follow, that every statute which deprived nonconformists of their right of eligibility to office, deprived them of a civil right, and was, therefore, penal? If Roman Catholics had been in possession of these offices, and deprived of them in consequence of their adherence to their religion by the statutes in question; some persons might have contended for the wisdom of the statutes, but none could have contended that they were not highly penal. But whatever difference there may be in the degree of penal infliction, there is none in the penal quality of those statutes, which deprive persons of offices, and those which deprive them of their prior legal eligibility to them. The right of possessing an office, the right of succeeding to it, and the right of eligibility to it, are equally civil rights. There is no difference, in this respect, between offices and landed property—the right to possess an estate, to succeed to it, and to acquire it, are equally civil rights. The justice or policy of these laws is not now under our consideration—the simple question before us is, Whether eligibility to offices and election into corporations, were not by the common law the civil right of every Englishman, and whether his being deprived of it was not a penal infliction? It is impossible to deny it. This infliction reaches every description of nonconformists to the Established Church; their religion, therefore, is not tolerated—it is persecuted. On the policy, the justice, or degree of that persecution, there may be a difference of opinion; but that, in some degree, at least, it is a persecution it seems impossible to deny. Thus we seem to arrive at this unquestionable conclusion, that, in point of fact, all nonconformists are persecuted. The difference between Roman Catholics and other nonconformists, is, that Roman Catholics are subject to pains and disabilities which do not affect any other description of nonconformists. The Roman Catholics, therefore, are the most persecuted of all.—Here then we close with our adversaries; we seek not to interfere with the Established Church, with her hierarchy, with her endowments, with her tythes, with any thing else that contributes to her honour, her comfort or her security. Give us but toleration in the true sense of that much abused word, and we claim no more. By the oath prescribed to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, by the 33d of his present majesty, the Roman Catholic swears—"That he will defend to the utmost of his power, the settlement and arrangement of property in that country, as established by the laws now in being; and he thereby disclaims, disavows and solemnly abjures any intention to subvert the present Church establishment, for the purpose of substituting a Catholic establishment, in its stead; and he solemnly swears, that he will not exercise any privilege to which he is or may be entitled, to disturb and weaken the Protestant religion, and Protestant government in that kingdom."

V.—But it is suggested, that *though it should be conceded, that all other nonconformists to the Church of England, ought to be admitted to a free and complete toleration, the Roman Catholics should be excluded from it, on account of their acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Pope.*—This admits of a very easy answer. The Roman Catholics certainly acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Pope; but they deny his temporal authority. They acknowledge no right, either in the Pope, or in any council, to interfere in any manner in temporal concerns, or to interfere by any mode of temporal power, in concerns of a spiritual nature. By the oath prescribed to the English Roman Catholics by the 31st of his present majesty, we swear, that "we do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign prince, prelate, state or potentate hath, or ought to have any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within the realm."—The Irish and Scotch Roman Catholic subjects of his majesty take a similar oath. The answers given by the foreign Universities, to the questions proposed to them by the direction of Mr. Pitt, the doctrines laid down in all our Catechisms, and other standard books of authority express the same belief. In the oaths taken by the Irish Roman Catholics, they swear, that "it is not an article of the Catholic faith and that they are not thereby bound to believe or profess, that the Pope is infallible; or that they are bound to obey any order, in its own nature immoral, though the Pope or any ecclesiastical power should issue or direct such an order; but that, on the contrary, they hold it sinful in them to pay any regard to such an order."—It is said, that the Popes on several occasions, have claimed and exercised the right of temporal power. We acknowlede it, and we lament it. But the fact is of little consequence; no Roman Catholic now believes, that either Pope or Council, or both Pope and Council acting together, have, or ought to have any right to interfere by any form or mode, either of temporal or spiritual power, in civil concerns; or to interfere by any form or mode of temporal power, in spiritual concerns. This the Irish, Scottish and English Roman Catholics have sworn, and they act up to their oaths.

VI. — I proceed to another charge:—*It is asserted to be a tenet of our faith, or, at least, a received opinion among us, that the Pope or the Church has a right to absolve subjects from their allegiance to their sovereign.*—But this doctrine has been most solemnly abjured by us, in the oaths which we have taken to government. It is disclaimed by the opinions of the foreign Universities; and Pope Pius the Sixth proscribed it, by his rescript of the 17th of June 1791.

VII.—The same may be said of the *charge brought against us, of holding it lawful to kill any sovereign or any private person under excommunication.* This doctrine is also disclaimed by us, in our oaths, as "unchristian and impious;" it is disclaimed in terms, equally strong, in the answers of the foreign Universities; and Pope Pius the Sixth, in his rescript of 1791, solemnly declares such a murder "to be a horrid and detestable crime."

VIII.—The same answer may also be given to the charge, of its being a *tenet of our church, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics.* In our oaths, we disclaim that doctrine also, "as impious and unchristian;" and the terms in which it is disclaimed in the answers of the foreign Universities, are equally strong. But, without entering further on the subject of this charge, we make this solemn appeal upon it, to the feelings and common sense of every reader of these pages;—Does not the single circumstance of our being, after the lapse of 200 years, petitioners to Parliament for the repeal of the penal and disabling laws to which we are subject, in consequence of our not taking oaths, the taking of which would, at once, have delivered us from all these penalties and disabilities, prove, beyond all exception and argument, that we do not believe the existence of any power which can dispense with the obligation of an oath? On this head I beg leave to add my own testimony—having, in almost every stage of life, lived in habits of acquaintance or intimacy with all descriptions of Roman Catholics, the young, the old, the literate, the illiterate, foreigners and natives, ecclesiastic and secular, I never knew one who did not hear the charge in question with indignation, and treat it as an execrable calumny.—But it is said, that the Council of Lateran assumed a right to temporal power, and that the Council of Constance authorized the violation of the safe conduct granted to John Huss. Both those facts are positively denied by the Roman Catholics. This is not a place for discussing the point —but what does it signify?—If the Council of Lateran claimed for the Pope, or itself, a right to temporal power, it did wrong; if the Council of Constance authorized the violation of the safe-conduct, it did infamously, and there's an end on't.

IX.—Having had frequent occasion to mention in these pages, *the answers of the foreign Universities to certain questions, proposed to them by the direction of Mr. Pitt*, the reader will probably wish to be better informed of the circumstances attending the transaction.—In the year 1788, the Committee of the English Catholics waited on Mr. Pitt, respecting their application for a repeal of the penal laws. He requested to be furnished with authentic evidence of the opinions of the Roman Catholic clergy, and the Roman Catholic Universities abroad, "on the existence and extent of the Pope's dispensing power." Three questions were accordingly framed, and submitted to his approbation. As soon as it was obtained, they were sent to the Universites of Paris, Louvain, Alcala, Douay, Salamanca and Valladolid, for their opinions. —The questions proposed to them were—1. Has the Pope, or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction or pre-eminence, whatsoever, within the realm of England?—2. Can the Pope or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, absolve or dispense with his majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever?—3. Is there any principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transaction, either of a public or a private nature?—The Universities answered unanimously—1. That the Pope or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, HAS NOT any civil authority, power, jurisdiction or pre-eminence, whatsoever, within the realm of England.—2. That the Pope, or cardinals or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, CANNOT absolve or dispense with his majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever.—3. That there is NO principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transactions, either of a public or a private nature.—Nothing can be more explicit than the answers of the Foreign Universities—some of them express perfect wonder, that such questions should be proposed to them by a nation that glories in her learning and discernment.—As soon as the opinions of the foreign Universities were received, they were transmitted to Mr. Pitt. But the Roman Catholics wish it to be most distinctly understood, that it was for *his* satisfaction, not *theirs*, that these opinions were taken. Assuredly, his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects did not want the wisdom of Foreign Universities to inform them, that his majesty is the lawful sovereign of all his Roman Catholic subjects, and that by every divine and human law, his Roman Catholic subjects owe him true, dutiful, active and unreserved allegiance.—The originals of these Questions and of the Answers to them, with the notarial authentications of them, have been produced in the House of Commons, by Sir John Cox Hippisley. They are in the custody of the writer of these pages, and are open to the inspection of every person who wishes to inspect them.

X.—It is also objected to the Roman Catholics, that it is *an article of their faith*, or, *at least*, *that they consider it to be lawful*, *to persecute heretics for their religious opinions*. All this the Roman Catholics most explicitly deny, and they consider it is completely denied in the solemn disclaimers made by them in all their oaths, of the direct or indirect right of the Pope or the church to temporal power; as, without temporal power, persecution cannot subsist.—They admit that many persons of their communion, both ecclesiastic and secular, have, at different times, been guilty of the crime of religious persecution; but they blame the conduct of those persons as severely as it is blamed by their Protestant brethren.—They also plead a tremendous set-off. The massacre of Paris, on St. Bartholomew's day, was most horrid; but it had been preceded by the atrocities, full as horrid, of the Anabaptist Protestants at Munster. To the burnings in the reign of Queen Mary, the Roman Catholics oppose the executions of priests in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth, and the three first princes of the House of Stuart: they apprehend, that more cannot be said against the revocation of the edict of Nantes, than against the deprivation of 2,000 Presbyterian ministers of their livings, by the Act of Uniformity. They also bring into account, Oates's plot; the sentence of death passed on Servetus, for errors against the Trinity, through the influence of Calvin, his execution and the justification of it by two of the principal pillars of the Reformed Church, Melanchton and Beza. Between those enormities it is not easy to strike a balance. But the Roman Catholics may justly ask, by what principle of justice, or by what fair course of reasoning, the Protestant is authorized to ascribe the instances of persecution, which he proves on Roman Catholics, to a principle of the Roman Catholic Creed, unless he allows at the same time, that the instances of persecution which the Catholic proves in the Protestant Church are equally attributable to some principle of the Protestant Creed. "Brother, brother, (say two known characters on the stage) we have both been in the wrong."—Let us learn wisdom from them; let us no more upbraid one another with our common failings; let us forget and forgive, bury all past animosities in oblivion, shake hands and be friends. This is the only rational mode of closing this—by far the most disgusting and disgraceful of all our controversies.

XI.—Another charge is brought against us by our adversaries, in consequence of the *doctrines imputed to us respecting sacerdotal absolution*. We are said to believe that the mere absolution of a priest, without any thing on our part, is a full remission of sin. In answer to this, we shall only transcribe the following passage from the Book of Prayers, for the use of Catholics serving in fleets and armies:—"You know, from the catechism you have learnt, and the books of Catholic instruction you have read, that the absolution of a priest can be of no benefit to you, unless you be duly disposed to a reconciliation with your offended God by true faith, by a sincere sorrow for all your sins, by a firm resolution never to commit them again, and by a willingness to satisfy God and your neighbour also, as far as justice requires. Without those dispositions on your part, the act of the priest would not be ratified in heaven; you would be guilty of the profanation of the sacrament of penance, and provoke the indignation of the Almighty, instead of obtaining his mercy."—It is not a little remarkable, that a canon of the English Church, in 1608, enjoining the priest not to make known to any one what had been revealed to him, bears such a similitude to the Roman Catholic doctrine on this head, that when it was produced by Sir John Cox Hippisley, in the House of Commons, Mr. Wilberforce interrupted him, by saying, that it was a canon, not of the English but the Romish Church, and expressed his astonishment when Sir John Hippisley shewed it to be one of the most recent canons which had been formed for the government of the Established Church.

XII.—One of the objections most strongly urged against the Roman Catholics, is *the tenet imputed to them, that none are saved out of their communion.*—I beg leave not to enter into a discussion of this objection, as it cannot be urged to us by a Protestant of the Established Church of England, as the Athanasian Creed forms a part of her Liturgy, and he swears that our doctrine of transubstantiation is damnable; or by a Protestant of the Established Church of Scotland, as the Protestants of that Church, in their Profession of Faith, of 1568, say, that "out of the church there is neither life nor everlasting happiness;" or by a Protestant of the French Huguenot Church, as in their Catechism, on the 10th article of the Creed, they profess, that "out of the church there is nothing but death and damnation."

XIII.—This leads us to observe, that *passages are often cited from the works of Roman Catholic writers, which express, that the Roman Catholic religion has always been the same; and that those who say that the modern Roman Catholics differ, in one iota, from their predecessors, either deceive themselves or wish to deceive others.* These passages have been cited to prove, that whatever doctrine any Pope or any ecclesiastical body, or any writer of approved authority, has maintained or sanctioned in former times, is universally approved of by the modern Catholics. But this is a very unjust perversion of the meaning of the writers, from whose writings these passages, or passages of a similar import, are cited. Not one of them approves of any act of temporal power which the Pope or any body of churchmen have ever claimed in right of their spiritual character. In the cited passages, the writers mean to assert no more than that the faith and essential discipline of Roman Catholics have always been what they now are. But they admit that the resort of the Popes, or of any other ecclesiastics to temporal power, for effecting the object of their spiritual commission, was not only no part of the faith or essential discipline of the church, but was diametrically opposite to its faith and discipline. The passages, therefore, to which we allude, can never be brought to prove the position for which they are quoted. To urge them for such a purpose, is evidently a gross perversion of their meaning.

XIV.—I shall only notice one further objection:—*The supposed immensity of the distance, between the Creed of the Established, and the Creed of the Roman Catholic Church; from which, it is inferred, that there always must be a spirit of religious discord, and never a communion of civil rights between the members of them.*—To this the experience of mankind gives a clear answer,—if you remove persecution you remove discord. If you do not compel a person to enter your church, he will shake hands with you at the door of it: and many years will not pass away before you will meet at the same altar.—But, is the difference between the churches really as great as it is generally thought?—The divine precept, that we should love our neighbour as ourselves, is equally recognized by Protestants and Roman Catholics. They are equally willing to have their conduct, on every occasion of life, tried by that golden rule. What further can government require, in the moral code of its subjects?—In respect to their religious code,—All Christians agree, 1st. that, there is one God; 2dly, that, he is a Being of infinite perfection; 3dly, that, he directs all things by his providence; 4thly, that, it is our duty to love God, with all our hearts; 5thly, that, it is our duty to repent of our sins; 6thly, that, God pardons the truly penitent; 7thly, that, there is a future state of rewards and punishments, where all mankind shall be judged according to their works; 8thly, that, God sent his Son into the world, to be its Saviour, the au-author of eternal salvation to all that obey him; 9thly, that, he is the true Messiah; 10thly, that, he worked miracles, suffered, died and rose again, as is related in the four gospels; and 11thly, that, he will, hereafter, make a second appearance on the earth, raise all mankind from the dead, judge the world in righteousness, bestow eternal life on the virtuous, and punish the workers of iniquity.—In the belief of these articles, all Christians, Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists, Arminians and Socinians are agreed. In addition to these articles, each division and subdivision of Christians has its own tenets. Now, let each settle among its own members, what are the articles of belief, peculiar to them, which, in their cool, deliberate judgment, they consider as absolutely necessary that a person should believe, to be a member of the church of Christ; let these articles be divested of all foreign matter, and expressed in perspicuous, exact and unequivocal terms; and above all, let each distinction of Christians earnestly wish to find an agreement between themselves and their fellow Christians:—the result of a discussion, conducted on this plan, would, most assuredly, be, to convince all Christians, that the essential articles of religious credence, in which there is a real difference amongst Christians, are not very numerous; and that, if the re-union of Christians be no more than a golden dream, the possible approximation to it is nearer than is generally supposed.—And, after all, is the re-union of the Roman Catholic and Protestant churches, absolutely impossible?—Bossuet, the glory of the Roman Catholic church, and her ablest champion, thought it was not.—Towards the end of the 17th century, the Emperor Leopold, and several princes in Germany, conceived a project of reuniting the Roman Catholic and Lutheran churches. In consequence of it, a correspondence took place between Bossuet, on the part of the Roman Catholics, and Molanus and Leibniz, on the part of the Lutherans. Molanus was director of the Protestant churches and consistories of Hanover; Leibniz was a member of the Aulic Council. In the exact sciences he was inferior to Newton alone; in metaphysics he had no superior; in general learning he had scarcely a rival; in the theological disputes of the times he was singularly conversant. The correspondence between these great men on the subject of the re-union, may be seen in the *Œuvres Posthumes de Bossuet, Vol. I.; Nouvelle Edition des Œuvres de Bossuet, Vol. XI.; Leibnizii Opera, studio Lud. Dutens, Vol. I. & V.;* and the *Pensées de Leibniz, 2 Vol. 8vo.* Every word of the correspondence deserves the perusal, both of the scholar and the divine. A short view of it is given, in the Account of the Life and Writings of Bossuet, recently published by the writer of these pages. It continued during ten years:—I shall transcribe from it the two following passages, from the letters written by Bossuet to Leibniz. "The Council of Trent," he says, in one of them, "is our stay; but, we shall not use it, to prejudice our cause. We shall deal more fairly with our opponents. We shall make the council serve for a statement and explanation of our doctrines. Thus we shall come to an explanation on those points, in which either of us imputes to the other what he does not believe, and on which we dispute, only because we misconceive each other. This may lead us far; for Molanus has actually conciliated the points, so essential, of justification and the eucharist. Nothing is wanting to him, on that side, but that he should be avowed. Why should we not hope to conclude in the same manner, disputes less difficult and of less importance?" The letter, from which the passage is extracted, was written in an early stage of the controversy: what might not be hoped from such a spirit of good sense and conciliation!—The letter, from which the following passage is extracted, was written in the tenth year of the correspondence: and I feel, that every reader of these pages will lament with me, that it is the last letter in the correspondence. "Among the divines of the Confession of Augsburgh," says Bossuet, "I always placed M. Molanus, in the first rank, as a man whose learning, candour and moderation, made him one of the persons, the most capable I have ever known, of advancing the NOBLE PROJECT OF RE-UNION. In a letter which I wrote to him, some years ago, by the Count Balatis, I assured him that, if he could obtain the general assent of his party to what he calls his Cogitationes Privatæ, I promised myself, that, by joining to them the remarks, which I sent to him, on the Confession of Augsburgh, and the other symbolic works of the Protestants, the work of the re-union would be perfected, in all its most difficult and most essential parts; so that well-disposed persons might, in a short time, bring it to a conclusion."

XV.—Such, then, being the charges brought against the Roman Catholics by their adversaries, and such being the defence made by the Roman Catholics to them, will not every candid Protestant admit, that the unfavourable opinion, which some still entertain of the civil and religious principles of Roman Catholics, is owing, in a great measure, to prejudice?—But we have the satisfaction to find, that the prejudice against us decreases rapidly. With the mildness and good-sense which distinguishes his respectable character, the Earl of Liverpool thus expressed himself, in his speech in the debate of the House of Lords, on the petition presented by the Irish Catholics, in 1810:—"I have heard allusions made this night, to doctrines which I do hope no man now believes the Catholics to entertain: nor is there any ground for an opinion that the question is opposed under any such pretence. The explanations which have been given on this head, so far as I know, are completely satisfactory, and the question as it now stands, is much more narrowed than it was on a former discussion."—[See his lordship's Speech, printed and published by Keating and Booker.] How very little beyond this declaration, and a legislative enactment in consequence of it, do the Roman Catholics solicit!

CHARLES BUTLER.

Lincoln's Inn, *Feb.* 5, 1813.

P. S. Since this letter was written, I hear, with infinite pleasure, that, by a legislative decree of the Cortes, the SPANISH INQUISITION IS UTTERLY ABOLISHED.—So perish every mode of religious persecution, by whom or against whomsoever raised!

[The *Oaths* and *Declarations* subjoined to this Address in our next.]

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

Historical Account of the Warrington Academy.

[Continued from p. 91.]

It now becomes the pleasing task of the writer of this memoir, to record such particulars as he has been enabled to collect, concerning an excellent person, to whom the Warrington Academy owed, if not its chief celebrity, its principal claims upon the public favour as a seminary of sound and useful learning, during a period of three-and-twenty years.

The Rev. John Aikin, D. D.

was born in London, on the twenty-eighth of December, 1713. His father, a native of Kirkcudbright in Scotland, had long been settled in London as a linen-draper, and married the daughter of a London citizen. The son was originally designed for trade, and was, for some time in the shop; and afterwards in the house of a foreign merchant, where he acquired an early use of, and extraordinary facility in the French language. A rooted passion, however, for literature, and a delicate state of health, caused him to be sent to a school at St. Alban's, kept by an ingenious man who had once been upon the stage, and was fond of exercising his boys in theatrical declamation: which circumstance, probably, gave the subject of this memoir an early taste for poetry, and also that force and clearness of enunciation, by which he was eminently distinguished. Though it is difficult to trace his juvenile years with exactness, the present writer is very sure that he distinctly recollects, on his shewing some of his pupils, as a curiosity, some specimens of the old court-hand, his saying, that he was at one time designed for a lawyer, and, on that occasion, learnt that hand. Nor is it improbable that this design continued for some time, as he possessed a deep and extensive knowledge of the constitution and laws of England, and had actually made some considerable progress in an elementary work, constructed much upon the plan of Blackstone (both being founded upon the method of Justinian's Institutes), when that able lawyer, on being raised to the Vinerian professorship at Oxford, published, in 1756, his Analysis as a text-book for the excellent course of lectures, which he afterwards gave to the world in his Commentaries. But his turn growing, probably, more and more decided for sacred literature, he became, in 1732, a pupil of Dr. Doddridge, and, after spending with him some years, (the remaining records of the seminary at Northampton, do not enable us to say how many,) he was indulged, by his father, with permission still further to pursue his studies, in the University of Aberdeen*. Here he enjoyed the benefit of the prælections of Dr. Thomas Blackwell, whose eminence in Greek literature appears to more advantage in his "Inquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer," than his proficiency in a chaste and simple style of writing; but who, as a professor, very greatly contributed to promote the study of the Greek language at Aberdeen. Here, also, he attended the lectures in philosophy of the other professors, particularly of Dr. George Turnbull, whose ethical works he valued highly, notwithstanding the uncouth language in which they are written. He was here also acquainted with Dr. Thomas Reid, and with Mrs. Cockburne, the defender of Locke and Clarke, whose husband was at that time minister of the English chapel at Aberdeen. Of Duncan and David Fordyce, the authors of the Treatises of Logic and Moral Philosophy, in the Preceptor, the present writer has heard him speak, as among the number of his associates. Professor Ogilvie, of King's College, reports, that he was thought very highly of by the professors at that time; and that he was in habits of particular intimacy with the late professor Thomas Gordon, between whom and his quondam fellow-student a correspondence was kept up through life; and on whose motion, without any previous solicitation, or even knowledge on his part, the degree of D. D. was conferred on him in the year 1774[*].

---

* When he was entered at Aberdeen cannot be made out, as his name is not in the matriculation-books of either college. It is probable that he was never regularly entered, his standing, both as to age and literature, rendering it inexpedient for him to go through the regular course; and that he only attended as a private student, such lectures as he thought proper. The situation of the writer of this article is exactly similar with regard to the University of Glasgow, in which he resided during the session 1781—2, after having completed his regular course at Warrington.

On his return from Aberdeen, he became an assistant to his former friend and tutor Dr. Doddridge, agreeably to the usual plan of that excellent person in the management of his academy, to engage, in succession, for several years, such students as had particularly distinguished themselves by diligence, proficiency and propriety of conduct, during the period of their academical course. Besides Mr. Aikin, Mr. Job Orton, Professor James Robertson, of Edinburgh, and Mr. Samuel Clark, of Birmingham, obtained this distinguishing mark of their tutor's approbation; and Mr. Orton observes,[*] that "they thought themselves happy in his friendship, and in the opportunities they had, by his conversation, instructions and example, to improve themselves, while they were assisting in the education of others." It is probable that he left Northampton, in 1739, and that Mr. Orton succeeded him. During this engagement he preached occasionally in various places, and is said to have been highly acceptable both for matter and manner. He was actually chosen by the congregation at Leicester, which was afterwards served for so many years, with such ability, by the Rev. Hugh Worthington, when a fall from his horse gave him an injury in the breast, which caused him to spit blood, and, in his opinion, disqualified him for the regular labours of the pulpit. He therefore gave up the design of settling with a congregation, and engaged in a school, for a short time, as partner with a Mr. Lee, of Farndon, near Harborough, in Leicestershire; but having married the daughter[†] of the Rev. John Jennings (the able tutor and predecessor of Doddridge,) he removed to Kibworth, where he raised a flourishing school by assiduities, which were almost too much for his tender health; for, after his accident above-mentioned, much speaking was always a toil to him, and he soon came to suffer under asthmatic attacks, which he always believed to have a consumptive tendency. It has been lamented by Mr. Wakefield, in his otherwise very just account of Dr. Aikin, that he was occasionally severe in his correction of his scholars. But those who know any thing of the variety of tempers and dispositions which occur in a numerous school, will not allow the reports of individual dullness and obstinacy, to stand against the warm attachment and even veneration of the general body. That Dr. Aikin's temper was capable of being moved; may well be expected by any one who considers his activity and energy of mind. But that he well knew how to support his authority and, in cases of delinquency, to command submission, by dignified remonstrance, and sometimes severe, but always irresistible, reproof, all those who were his pupils at a subsequent period, must be sufficiently sensible: and that he was not, therefore, likely, except in extreme cases, to need the unpleasant recourse to corporal punishment, may well be presumed. If to this we add the opposing testimony which the writer possesses, we may be satisfied that the discipline of his school was far from rigorous, compared with the manners of the time. That he encouraged his scholars, according to their capacity, as he afterwards did his pupils of a higher class, to free familiar conversation, and even debate, we have a pleasing specimen in the interesting Memoirs of Mr. Cappe, prefixed to his posthumous works, by his excellent widow.*

---

[*] In the Album of "S. Theologiæ Doctores," of King's College, Aberdeen, is the following entry:— "1774. Maii 12, Mr. Joannes Aiken, in Academia de Warrington." It was characteristic of the Dr. that when he received his diploma, totally unapprized that any such thing was in agitation, he was much discomposed, and could scarcely be persuaded to take the title. No man, indeed, was ever more averse to parade of any kind.

[*] Memoirs of Doddridge, p. 71.

[†] This excellent lady's mother, whose memory has been embalmed by one of the most beautiful productions of her grand-daughter's muse, was a daughter of Sir Francis Wingate, Knt. by the lady Ann Annesley, daughter of the first Earl of Anglesey. From another of the Wingates the Belshams are descended; a circumstance to which Mr. W. Belsham alludes, in his Essay on the character of the first Earl of Anglesey. Hist. and Lit. Essays.

With regard to the general body of pupils at a country school, situated in the midst of a manufacturing district, it may be presumed that they were chiefly designed for business; nor is it easy at this distance of time, to recollect many who were afterwards known in the literary world. To Mr. Cappe, however, may be added a living and venerable character, Dr. Cogan, of Clapton; and your obituary of last month (p. 52.) adds another to the list, in Mr. Hirons of St. Albans. One of his particular friends, during his residence at Kibworth, was Dr. (then Mr.) Pulteney, of Leicester, who afterwards distinguished himself as an eminent naturalist and physician.

After many years thus laboriously spent, he removed to Warrington in the month of August, 1758, chiefly induced by the expectation of living more to himself, (for he determined to have no boarders, though oten much solicited), and of enjoying some society suited to his highly cultivated taste. On his arrival, the establishment of the academy was considered as complete, as far at least, as the funds of the institution would admit. The new tutor entered immediately upon the classical department; besides which, he had two classes in the French language, gave lectures on grammar, oratory and criticism, and also took those on logic and history from Mr. Holt.

---

* See Devotional Sermons, Pref. p. 14.

His mode of lecturing on the Greek and Roman classics was highly interesting, and had a great effect in promoting among his pupils a taste for the critical study of those venerable remains of antiquity. A perfect master of the languages in which they were written, and familiarly acquainted with their contents, he contrived to put his young friends in possession of the necessary previous requisites to the thorough understanding of the several works which he thus introduced to their attention. One or two lectures were usually devoted to some general account of the author, the period in which he lived, the occasion of his writing, and the manner in which he treated his subject; which were naturally followed with remarks on the species of composition, whether historical, oratorical or philosophical, if prose, or, if poetry, epic, dramatic, lyric, satirical, &c. These preliminaries dispatched, he made the students read successively, paragraph by paragraph, under his correction, the author under consideration, and pointed out the beauties, cleared up the difficulties, and illustrated the scope and tendency of the argument, with uncommon clearness and precision. His choice of books, also, was generally very judicious: avoiding those authors that are usually read at schools, he rather chose to lead them to an acquaintance with such as might not otherwise be likely to fall in their way; and of these he preferred those which bore some relation to the leading objects of their other studies. In history, for instance, he chose such portions of Herodotus, as might illustrate those parts of the Old Testament which were connected with Assyria and Egypt; the fine funeral orations of Thucydides, Plato and Lysias; the contest between Demosthenes and Æschines; the philosophical and ethical treatises of Plato, Aristotle, Epictetus, Marcus Antoninus and Max. Tyrius; with Aristotle's Poetic and Rhetoric, and Longinus. In poetry, the Odyssey in preference to the Iliad, some parts of Hesiod, and the three Greek tragedians, of whom he was very fond. In Latin, Lucretius, Lucan, Statius, Persius and Juvenal among the poets, the philosophical and moral treatises of Cicero and Seneca, Tacitus, the two Plinys and Quintilian, in prose. When there were several young men designed for the law, he, more than once, read with them Justinian's Institutes. In reading the ancient poets, his extensive acquaintance with modern poetry enabled him to enliven his lectures with parallel passages, and his fine taste to dwell with peculiar delight, and impress upon the minds of his pupils, those passages of either ancient or modern poets, which appeared most striking for noble sentiments or just reflections. In reading the philosophical treatises of the ancients, he enlarged so much as to render his lectures almost a second course, in a varied form, of natural religion and ethics. And he all along, made it a principal object, incidentally to illustrate scripture-passages, by the heathen writers, and to point out the superiority of Christian to heathen philosophy.

On Dr. Taylor's death, he was unanimously chosen his successor in the theological chair. His diffidence, however, rendered him very reluctant to undertake it, and he took great pains to persuade his friend, Mr. Clark, of Birmingham, to accept the place. A happier choice, however, could not have been made, than that which was made. Without any disparagement to his venerable predecessor, to whom he was not, perhaps, much inferior in Hebrew literature, and decidedly his superior in the other languages of antiquity, he possessed also this advantage, that with a very large and extensive acquaintance with theological works, on each side of every question, he had no system of his own construction to maintain, and, having never committed himself as a controversial writer, he could, with more complete impartiality, examine all sides, and place the evidence for each before his pupils. By those who are acquainted with the power of habit and association, this remark will not be considered as conveying the slightest imputation on the memory of Dr. Taylor; who, the writer is persuaded, was equally clear of all conscious prepossession, but who, if he could at once have laid aside all bias towards the train of thought which he had been pursuing through the laborious investigations of a long life, must have been something more or less than man.

Concerning the mode in which, from the beginning, Dr. Aikin conducted his theological lectures, the writer is happy in being permitted to avail himself of the information of one of his earliest pupils, who is still a living credit to his Alma Mater, and whose writings on the Language of Scripture, and on the Internal and Presumptive Evidences of Christianity, evince the excellence of his tutor's instructions.

"Dr. Aikin used some printed text-book for most of his lectures; for others he had written analyses or hints of his own. Upon all of these he enlarged much in his discourse, with great fluency, propriety and impression. His modes of illustration were uncommonly distinct and various, and pointedly adapted to the different talents of his pupils. He was always interesting, and frequently animated. He stated the arguments on both sides of any disputed point, with great clearness and precision. After this, his custom was to stop, and say, 'Gentlemen, have I explained the subject to your satisfaction?' or some equivalent expression. Any one, who did not fully comprehend him, was asked to state his difficulty. He then, in order to illustrate further, proceeded upon a quite different mode of explanation, which he would vary again, if requested by any present. In any disputed point in metaphysics, morals or theology, he avoided any dictatorial declaration of his own opinion, and freely encouraged his pupils to form their own. When any student embraced a sentiment different from what he imagined to be his tutor's, he, without any scruple, mentioned it, together with his reasons for it. A difference of opinion in the pupil produced no diminution of regard in the tutor, or of attention to his instruction. So attractive, indeed, was his manner of teaching, that I have seen gentlemen, who, some years after they had left the academy, when they were occasionally passing through Warrington, and staying there only a few hours, joined the students in attending his lecture. And I particularly remember a young gentleman of fortune, who was repeatedly and strongly reprimanded by the Dr. for his misconduct, while he expressed to me the vexation he felt at these reproofs, and the deep impression which the Dr's mode of delivering them made upon him, continued, notwithstanding, to attend even the moral lectures, which, he said, were highly interesting to him."

In the present writer's time, the course pursued by the divinity-students was nearly as follows. From the first to the third year, besides pursuing their classical and mathematical studies, and attending the lectures on the belles lettres, history and natural philosophy, under the other tutors, they were immediately entered by Dr. Aikin, on the study of the Hebrew language, and conducted through a course of logic; the second year they proceeded to pneumatology and ethics; in the former of which he took Doddridge for his text-book, but by no means closely confined himself to that writer's method, and not at all to his particular views on the various subjects treated of in that multifarious work, the plan of which had been originally laid by Mr. John Jennings, Doddridge's tutor, and Dr. Aikin's father-in-law; but, having been continually receiving fresh additions, it had lost that unity of scheme, and concatenation of subjects, which alone could render the mathematical form excusable. In ethics, he sometimes followed Doddridge's method, but more frequently pursued a scheme of his own, not, however, materially differing from that of David Fordyce, in the Preceptor. Whichever plan he pursued, he amplified upon his written notes, by copious extemporary enlargements, enlivened by quotations of the most spirited passages of the ancient poets and moralists; nor was he sparing of illustrations from the scriptures, thereby rendering his ethical instructions not a mere course of lectures on natural religion, and social and personal virtue, but interweaving (as Paley has since done) the scheme of Jewish and Christian ethics, with able vindications of the superior wisdom, propriety and authority of both their rules and sanctions. In the division of ethics, usually denominated jurisprudence, he availed himself of his legal knowledge, to discuss a great variety of questions relating to the interests, duties, and rights of men, both civil and religious, with the principles which ought to regulate both civil and commercial intercourse; and he thus introduced to the knowledge of his pupils, the principal topics of the science now called political philosophy and economy.

A course of this kind would naturally prepare the youthful mind for entering with an attention suited to its importance on the investigation of the evidences of revealed religion. This composed the chief business of the third year. In this part of the course, Doddridge was taken as a text-book; and there can scarcely be a better. He objected, indeed, to the presupposition of evidence, external and internal, which may be expected to attend a divine revelation, (Props. xcv. & xcvii), as a sort of begging of the question, and to the idea of uncontrouled miracles in Def. lxix, in opposition to which, he insisted largely on the importance of Mr. Farmer's notion of miracles; and he introduced a variety of additional remarks on the evidences of Christianity, particularly those suggested by the objections of Hume and Gibbon.

The fourth year was devoted to the long miscellaneous series of subjects, contained in the remainder of Doddridge's course; consisting of a review of the various schemes which have been formed of the doctrines of revelation, respecting God, the Son and the Spirit, the fall, and the recovery of man by the mediation of Jesus, the positive institutions, the Christian sabbath, the doctrine of angels and the future state. It must be confessed that there is a great apparent fairness in a review of this sort; and it will be admitted by all who have attended his lectures, that Dr. Aikin reported the various schemes of the numerous authors referred to by Doddridge, or of those who, having published their works since Doddridge's death, were introduced by the Dr. himself, with all possible justice and impartiality. It may, however, be doubted whether this plan of bringing the doctrines of fallible men successively in review, before a set of youthful hearers, might not be likely either to lead them to fix upon some "master" in theology; or to make them conceited sciolists, imagining themselves at once fully qualified to judge and decide on questions which have exercised the wits of the wisest and best of men; or else to induce the opposite extreme of scepticism, on subjects, with regard to which they find such men coming to such different and even opposite conclusions. These several effects the writer thinks he has observed in different young persons, according to the notions which they had respectively formed of the extent of their own powers. Is it not likely, that a steady and settled, as well as free and unbiassed, system of opinions, touching the doctrines of revelation, will be formed, with greater advantage, by a careful, critical examination of the original scriptures? and when these have once been closely investigated, the mind will be prepared to judge, with greater ability as well as fairness, concerning the result of other men's researches.

The fifth year was employed in the study of Jewish antiquities, ecclesiastical history, the pastoral care, &c.; and the students were at liberty to refresh their memories with attending any part of the course of the four former years. Their time, besides, was much taken up with engagements to preach, among the numerous congregations which are scattered over that part of Lancashire and Cheshire; either for the supply of vacancies, or for the occasional accommodation of resident ministers. In the preparation of sermons for this purpose, they had every assistance and direction, both as to method and language, of which they chose to avail themselves, without the slightest interference with sentiments, unless in the way of friendly suggestion; but never of authoritative interference.

During the whole course, one lecture was given weekly, to all the divinity-students together, on the Hebrew scriptures, and one on the Greek Testament; in which the students construed, successively, their respective portions of the sacred text, and the Dr. entered into a minute critical doctrinal and practical explanation of each passage. In this way some considerable portion, but very far short of the whole of either Testament, was got through in the five years' course. What was done, however, it must be confessed, was very thoroughly and well done.

Every Saturday, the divinity-students were expected to bring the exercises which had been prescribed to them, or which they had chosen for themselves. These for the students of the first year, were generally essays on subjects connected with their course, or Latin translations, or short original essays in that language; in the second and third years, they were schemes or skeletons, more or less clothed, of sermons; in the fourth and fifth, sermons at length and, sometimes, critical dissertations. These were read by the students, and carefully criticized by the tutor; the defects of composition and method pointed out; and, often, references made to preachers of reputation, French or English, who had treated the same text or subject. Sometimes, when the subject interested him, he would lay out a method of his own, and, in a happy strain of dignified eloquence, pursue the subject, *extempore*, to a considerable extent. After the exercises were examined, he would generally turn to some of the finest passages of the English poets, Milton, Pope, Thomson, Young and Akenside; and, having first himself read a considerable portion, with singular propriety of tone and emphasis, he heard each of the students read in order, and freely, but good-humouredly, commented on their manner of reading, pointed out their defects, and the proper mode of remedying them.—This lecture was often the most satisfactory and improving of any in the whole week.

But the advantages which the students derived from their tutor, were not confined to the lecture-room: he had frequent small parties to drink tea with him, when he was accustomed quite to unbend, and enter with them into the most free familiar conversation. Then was the time when difficulties were most freely communicated, and with the most unwearied patience, listened to and obviated; his opinion of books, or of courses of reading on particular subjects, was asked and frankly given: sometimes (but this was generally when younger students were of the party) he took the lead in the conversation, and himself pointed out books which might be read with advantage; and frequently he enlivened the social hour with anecdotes of his own youthful years; of the difficulties which had occurred in the course of his own studies, and how he had surmounted, or suffered by them; of the varieties of character among his fellow students, and (by way, sometimes of encouragement, sometimes of warning) the manner in which they had turned out in the subsequent periods of life.

This excellent man lived always in perfect harmony with his colleagues, and with the trustees, and on all occasions acted as a general friend and a bond of union. His influence over the students, which was very great, arose not merely from the excellence of his instructions, but from the kind concern which he took in their welfare, and the affectionate interest with which he always tempered the authority which appeared in his private advices, or, where he saw it necessary, his reproofs and remonstrances. Being, of course, constantly spoken of in the language of warm attachment and reverence by the students who were his immediate pupils, he became the object of a veneration bordering upon awe among those who were not; and though his delicate state of health prevented his frequent personal intercourse with the students at large, and absolutely precluded his taking part in the ordinary routine of academical discipline, yet this very circumstance gave additional weight to his authority when circumstances occurred that called for his interference; which was always exercised after a previous cool, clear-sighted investigation, which put him in possession of the whole case; after which his decision was made with promptitude and firmness, and the measures dictated by it were declared and executed, with a dignity and propriety peculiar to himself, and always perfectly efficient.

After Mr. Walker's departure from the academy, in 1773, the funds of the institution being not thought adequate to the maintainance of a third tutor, Dr. Enfield undertook the mathematical department, and Dr. Aikin exonerated him of the classical part of his former charge. Though this unreasonable imposition on two willing and generous minds, materially injured the health of both, yet for some time Dr. Aikin was kept in a tolerably comfortable state, by great care and regular gentle exercise on horse-back. But about the year 1778, his attacks of asthma becoming more frequent and violent, he obtained for a short time the assistance of his late pupil, Mr. Houghton, and in 1779, Mr. Wakefield was chosen a regular third tutor. The asthmatic paroxysms, however, increasing, he grew gradually less able to discharge, without great difficulty, the duties of his proper province; and on the 14th of December, 1780, he closed a life of honour and usefulness, in a manner becoming his Christian profession. His death was felt as a severe blow, by all the friends of truth and learning; but was an irreparable loss to those students who were under his immediate care. He was attended by the whole academical body to his grave, on the north side of the parish church, (a spot that has often since been visited); and on the following Sunday, Dr. Enfield pronounced an elegant and well-drawn, but somewhat diffuse, (yet not sufficiently particular) eulogium, on his late venerable colleague, in the form of a funeral sermon. It was afterwards published; the title-page bears the following strikingly characteristic motto, from Cicero.

"Erant in eo plurimæ literæ, nec eæ vulgares, sed interiores quædam et reconditæ: summa verborum et gravitas et elegantia: atque hæc omnia vitæ decorabat dignitas et integritas. Quanta se-veritas in vultu! quantum pondus in verbis! quam nihil non consideratum exibat ex ore!"

A monument was erected to his memory in the Dissenters' chapel at Warrington, at the expence of the trustees of the academy, which bears the following inscription, written by Mr. Wakefield.

M. S.
Reverendi Viri Joannis Aikin, D.D.
In Academiâ Warringtonianâ
Primò Literarum Humaniorum,
Deinde Theologiæ
Per Annos viginti tres
Professoris.
Judicio imprimis limato, candido, subtili,
Liberalium penitiorumque doctrinarum
disciplina
Instructissimi.

Comis, Benevolus, Pius,
Et Hominis et Christiani munera
Cumulatissimè explevit.
Obiit die quarto decimo Decembris
Anno Salutis 1780. Ætatis 67.
Academiæ Curatores
Honoris ergô
Ponendum statuerunt.

After the beautiful passage from the most elegant of Roman writers which had been previously applied to this all-accomplished character, perhaps the classical readers of the Repository will pronounce it to have been a bold attempt, to delineate so much excellence in other words of the same language. They, probably, will think that Mr. Wakefield has been more successful, and certainly the generality of your readers will be better pleased with the following character of his friend and colleague, in his native tongue.*

"Our Divinity Tutor, Dr. Aikin, was a gentleman whose endowments, as a man and as a scholar, according to my sincere judgment of him, it is not easy to exaggerate by panegyric. In his life he was rigorously virtuous, and, when I knew him, under as perfect a self-government as a participation of human weaknesses can well allow. He has acknowledged to me his irascible propensities in early life, and the difficulties which he had encountered in this discipline of his temper. Religion had brought every wayward idea and irregular passion into subjection to the laws of reason, and had erected her trophy in the citadel of his mind.—As his whole conduct was strictly moral, so the influences of religion upon his mind were permanent and awful. He was benevolent and candid in all his judgments on the characters of others; of great hospitality, as I myself experienced; quick to discern, and ready to acknowledge, true merit, wherever it resided; not tenacious of his own opinions, but patiently attentive, beyond almost any man I ever knew, to the reasonings of an opponent; perfectly open to conviction; of an affability, softened by a modest opinion of himself, that endeared him to all; and a politeness of demeanour seldom found even in an elevated station.

"His intellectual attainments were of a very superior quality indeed. His acquaintance with all the evidences of revelation, with morals, politics, and metaphysics, was most accurate and extensive. Every path of polite literature had been traversed by him, and traversed with success. He understood the Hebrew and French languages to perfection; and had an intimacy with the best authors of Greece and Rome, superior to what

---

* Memoirs of Wakefield, 1st, Ed. p. 203.

I have ever known in any dissenting minister from my own experience. His taste for composition was correct and elegant; and his repetition of beautiful passages, though accompanied with a theatrical stateliness and pomp, highly animated and expressive of sensibility.

"This incomparable person left behind him two children, worthy of such a father, Mrs. Barbauld and Dr. John Aikin, the undoubted heirs of his talents and virtues. The fine genius and noble sentiments of these distinguished characters have been ascertained by too many monuments of literature to require the feeble efforts of my pen in their commendation. It is sufficient for friendship to have woven this perishable wreath, to place, as she was passing by, on the pillar of their fame."

The present writer has only to add his sincere regret, that it has not occurred to these distinguished persons to raise a monument to the memory of our Alma Mater. How many curious and interesting facts, connected with the Warrington Academy, would their personal acquaintance with it, from its rise to its dissolution, have supplied, which are in danger of being lost in oblivion! By how many beautiful effusions of the muse, might various incidents and scenes have been enlivened, which no one else is authorised to introduce! Above all, how might the excellent character, which has here been so imperfectly sketched, have appeared if its features had been traced by the pencil of filial duty, and "Our Poetess" had resumed the pen which wrote the verses on the death of Mrs. Jennings, to pour

A Daughter's sorrows o'er her Father's
urn.

V. F.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. Belsham on the Controversy between Dr. Priestley and Bp. Horsley; in Reply to the strictures of the Rev. H. Horsley, on the Calm Inquiry.--Letter I.

Essex House, March 3. 1813.

Sir,

My theological publications have occasionally attracted the notice and called forth the animadversions of some respectable and learned divines of the established church. To these I have not usually judged it necessary to reply: not only from my general aversion to controversy, but from a conviction of the inutility of discussion with gentlemen who are tied down to a particular system of belief. For my object being to discover truth wherever it is to be found, and theirs to defend a thesis already established; it is not probable that we shall agree in the same conclusions. Not to mention that the tone of supercilious dogmatism which is assumed by some of these writers, indicates a disposition rather to run down an opponent than to examine his arguments. A case however has lately occurred which appears to authorize a departure from the general rule.

Indignant, I confess, that the well-learned wreath of victory should be torn from the brow of my late revered and learned friend, Dr. Priestley, and awarded to his defeated and baffled antagonist, and that, not only in such coarse party publications as Evangelical Magazines, Eclectic Reviews, and British Critics, but even in the most respectable and candid of the literary journals, where a more just and discriminating judgment might reasonably have been expected, I annexed to the first part of the "Calm Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ," an Appendix, containing an impartial and detailed Review of the principal topics in controversy between Bishop Horsley and Dr. Priestley: from the perusal of which the intelligent reader would be enabled to form a judgment on which side the victory lies: and I will presume to add, that upon this subject, in the minds of the candid and well-informed, there can be but one opinion.

This plain and distinct representation of the case has given great offence to many, who were disposed to believe, upon the authority of the Quarterly Review, and other publications of still higher repute, that "Dr. Priestley was a giant in controversy, till he was vanquished by a giant greater than himself." Amongst others, it has excited the attention, and moved the indignation of the Reverend Heneage Horsley, son of the late prelate, a prebendary of St. Asaph, and now resident at Dundee. This zealous ecclesiastic, who amply establishes the legitimacy of his extraction by inheriting a double portion of his father's spirit, from his secluded habitation in the bleak mountains of the North, has given vent to his ire against the author of the Calm Inquiry, in a style as blustering as if he had been inspired by old Boreas himself: and in a laboured Appendix to a late republication of his father's Tracts, he has endeavoured to support the tottering fabric of the learned prelate's theological fame: with what success will appear in the sequel. This new edition is dedicated, by permission, to the Prince Regent, who, it appears, acceded to the reverend editor's petition, with his usual benignity; thereby affording, as the author gratefully and dutifully "acknowledges, to the church of England, at a crisis when those *who hate her wrongfully, are many in number and mighty*, the high consolation, that she finds in him what she ever found in his illustrious father, not merely a nominal, but a real defender of her faith."

Ah, luckless Unitarians! They have no access to the royal ear; they bask in no princely smiles; they find no advocates or patrons in courts or parliaments; they have no glorious prospects of crosiers, mitres, palaces and thrones, to glitter before their eyes, and to stimulate their pious zeal.—Be it so. But, if truth be their's, they are content. They prefer truth in rags, to error in an episcopal robe.

Having therefore no hope of meeting my opponent on this vantage ground, I solicit the use of a few pages in your valuable Repository, for the purpose of exposing the futility of the reverend writer's remarks. So futile indeed are they, that I should have regarded them as utterly unworthy of notice, had I not thought on the one hand, that some attention was due to a son advocating the cause of a father, and had I not been apprehensive on the other, that bold assertions and uncontradicted misrepresentations, might pass with the ignorant and unwary for established truths.

The reverend editor's preface, which begins with a despicable insult upon the memory and the sufferings of the venerable Priestley,—which assumes, in contradiction to notorious fact, that the Unitarians were intimidated, forsooth, while bishop Horsley lived, from prosecuting with vigour their sacred cause—which grossly misrepresents and traduces the means which they employ for accelerating the diffusion of primitive christianity, and particularly of the glorious and long-lost doctrine of the unity of God—and which concludes with the heavy, but unproved, and unproveable charge against the author of the Calm Inquiry, of being a "falsifier of history and a defamer of the character of the dead,"—this notable preface I dismiss as undeserving of further notice, and totally irrelevant to the question in discussion, which is simply this, whether the author of the Calm Inquiry has given a correct view of the controversy between bishop Horsley and Dr. Priestley, and whether his conclusions are fairly drawn.

That the reviewer of this celebrated controversy may be duly sensible of the awful distance which subsists between himself and the elevated personage upon whose writings he has presumed to animadvert, it is gravely remarked, page 587. "Whether Mr. B. was restrained by any prudential motives from making these observations on the reasoning of Bishop Horsley, during that prelate's life, is probably known to Mr. B. himself."—Yes, Sir, it is known to Mr. B. and he can assure the reverend Prebendary that he was deterred by no such considerations as those to which this gentleman may allude, from reviewing the controversy during the bishop's life. Nor does he know that he should ever have published his thoughts upon the subject, had it not been for the unblushing confidence of bishop Horsley's partizans, in claiming for their chief that palm of victory, which he did not, and which I will take upon myself to say that he well knew that he could not claim for himself. Otherwise, why did he not reply to his learned antagonist's last and triumphant challenge. I wrote to vindicate the fair fame of my revered friend who, as well as his vaunting antagonist, was gone "to those unseen abodes where the din of controversy, and the din of war, are equally unheard." I wrote, not as I am unjustly traduced, to *defame* but to *vindicate* the character of the dead. I wrote, that they who may hereafter persist in robbing Dr. Priestley of the honour which is his due, may sin with their eyes open, and without any excuse, and may speedily be exposed to the ignominy which they deserve.

The reverend gentleman adds, "I will venture to assure Mr. B. that the bishop, were he now alive, and possessed of all his youthful ardour, would not deign to take the smallest notice of his observations."—Indeed, Sir, I should not have expected it; for a prelate to descend from the "throne of preferment," into the arena of controversy, to enter the lists with a simple presbyter of the non-conformist communion, is contrary to all ecclesiastical precedent and etiquette. If Dr. Priestley's challenge which was enforced by every consideration of honour and duty was declined, it was little to be expected that the far humbler pretensions of the reviewer of the controversy should attract episcopal regard. Besides, why may we not believe that bishop Horsley possessed some portion of the discretion of the far-famed soldier of Lucullus, who after he had replenished his purse refused to scale a fortress. "*Ibit eo, quo vis, qui zonam perdidit, inquit.*" No, no: it is not in the class of men whose pockets are filled, and whose ambition has been crowned with success, that you are to look for volunteers in the perilous field of theological discussion. "Let him storm castles who has ne'er a groat."

The reverend gentleman who appears to have set himself the task of filling up fifty octavo pages without having much to say upon the question at issue, often indulges himself in discursive ramblings, and touches upon topics which have none, or at best a very remote affinity with the subject in hand; especially if he imagines that it will afford him an opportunity of aiming a thrust, right or wrong, at his adversary. Amongst other equally appropriate observations he relates p. 569, that he has been told that Mr. B. published some years ago a compendium of Logic, upon which, though he has never seen it, he is pleased, upon hear-say evidence, to pass a sentence of condemnation. Mr. B. pleads guilty to the charge. He acknowledges that some years ago, he did prefix a compendium of Logic to a volume which he published upon the Philosophy of the Human Mind. The system which he adopted was that of Locke and Hartley; names which are the ornament and pride of Oxford and Cambridge, but which are not held in equal estimation beyond the Tweed. For they professed not to discover truth by instinct, but by laborious ratiocination. The reverend gentleman tells us that his right reverend father "was a greater master than most men both of the Aristotelian and Baconian logic." In what school he has himself studied the dialectic art we are not informed. But of his great proficiency in it, I shall proceed to exhibit a curious specimen, which will enable the reader to form a judgment of the entertainment which he may expect from the perusal of this elaborate Appendix.

The reviewer of the controversy having stated the famous challenge which Dr. Priestley gives to his learned opponent, to reply to his last animadversions, concludes with the following paragraph, Calm Inquiry, p. 439,—

"To this animated challenge the right reverend adversary made no reply. The oracle was silent. The warfare was accomplished. The prize was won. And the contending parties retired from the field, equally well satisfied with the result of the conflict, Dr. Priestley with his VICTORY, and Dr. Horsley with his MITRE."

Now Sir, I believe it would puzzle the most ingenious of your readers to divine the conclusion which our profound logician draws from this plain and innocent paragraph, and the awful charge which he founds upon it. From these simple premises he infers that the author is guilty of blasphemy, and charges him with an arrogant assumption of the attributes of Deity.—Nay, Sir, do not smile. The pious prebendary, I assure you, is serious. His charge is grave and solemn. To convince you, I will cite his own words as they stand in p. 565. of his late publication. "Mr. B. claims to himself what he will not allow to his Redeemer, the divine attribute of searching the heart: and declares that both the contending parties retired from the field, well satisfied with the result of the conflict, Dr. Priestley with his Victory, and Dr. Horsley with his Mitre."

As to the facts upon which this tremendous charge is founded, I am confident of the truth of the assertion, so far as it relates to Dr. Priestley; for I have often heard my venerable friend express the gratification which he felt in his complete triumph over his learned opponent. And as to the bishop I did presume, but it seems without sufficient warrant, that Dr. Horsley was also *well satisfied* with his mitre. Upon the authority therefore of his son, who must have had the best means of information, the paragraph in a future edition may be corrected in some such form as this: the parties retired from the conflict, Dr. Priestley well satisfied with his victory, but Dr. Horsley not equally well satisfied with his mitre: but whether from consciousness that he had not fairly earned so high a prize, or from an opinion that a Welsh diocese was not a suitable reward of his pre-eminent merits, has not been explained.*

So much for the facts: As to the logic of the case, it far surpasses my poor ability, who am but a humble disciple of Locke and Hartley, to discern the slightest connexion between the premises and the conclusion. That it should be blasphemy to say that an archdeacon was well satisfied with being made a bishop, is a doctrine, which to me is quite new, and passing strange. And here I must leave it; not without expressing my admiration of that sublime logic which in a case of such difficulty could supply the media of proof. After all, I heartily forgive my angry assailant all his "sins, negligences and ignorances," all his misrepresentations, sneers and calumnies, and thank him most cordially for his severe and unsparing animadversions. Not that I lay claim to the character of being the meekest of men: but because, with the most evident good-will to the contrary, he has completely confirmed the impartiality of the review of the controversy in the Calm Inquiry, and the correctness of the conclusion in favour of Dr. Priestley. With the most anxious desire to do justice to both the contending parties, and to lay before the public a fair and impartial review of the discussion, the author could not but be conscious of his own attachment to the person and cause of his revered and learned friend; and therefore suspicious lest personal affection should inadvertently and unintentionally give a bias to his judgment, and affect the correctness of his representation of the arguments on either side. And as soon as he could procure the publication of his opponent, he perused his animadversions with eager attention, determined that nothing intemperate or offensive in the language or the manner of the writer, should prevent him from doing justice to an injured party, or withhold him from the retractation of any error which he had inadvertently committed. He is now satisfied. The man who of all others is most deeply interested to guard Bishop Horsley's theological fame, has come forward in his defence: and while every page of his animadversions breathes virulence and malignity against the author of the review, he has not succeeded in pointing out a single error of reasoning, or mis-statement of fact. In effect, he has left the reviewer master of the field; and has allowed him no opportunity of evincing the sincerity of his professions by the retractation of a single error. His triumph is complete; and the only circumstance which can abate his satisfaction is, the doubt whether his reverend adversary possesses information sufficient to form a judgment in the case, and whether his filial piety may not have tempted him to overstep the limits of sound discretion.

---

* It is well known that Dr. Horsley owed his mitre to Lord Thurlow, then Chancellor, who in his usual blunt and forcible language, which I shall not repeat, expressed the obligations which the church was under to her learned and subtle advocate. But it is well known among his private friends, that the noble lord, who perfectly understood how to appreciate historical evidence, who was not to be imposed upon by a *bow-wow* manner, and who occasionally amused his leisure hours by looking into this celebrated controversy, was not unacquainted with the real merits of the question.

Of the justice of these observations your inquisitive and intelligent readers will I trust be qualified to decide, if you will do me the honour to admit, and they to read a few letters, with which I propose to trouble you upon this subject in some succeeding numbers of your excellent Repository. In the mean time, I remain, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

T. BELSHAM.

Mr. Woolston.

January 4, 1813.

SIR,

I observe that Lord Kaimes, in his *Elements of Criticism*, (Vol. ii. Chap. 18, Sec. 2.) introduces, as a *literary* example, the following passage:

"At St. Bride's Church, in Fleet Street, Mr. Woolston, (who writ against the miracles of our Saviour,) in the utmost terrors of conscience, made a public recantation."

There is no date or reference to an authority, nor was it necessary for the purpose of Lord Kaimes. I shall thank any of your readers to mention the work from which this quotation was taken. The circumstance is not noticed in Woolston's Life in the Biog. Brit. nor is such a concession consistent with the spirit there attributed to him. He appears, in that work, rather as an honest *enthusiast*. It is well known how Woolston was persecuted by church and state, and how enlightened a christian *Lardner* appeared, upon the subject of that persecution, when compared with the *prelates* of his time.

BEREUS.

A Family Bible.

Nov. 30, 1812.

Sir,

While every orthodox magazine and almost every newspaper contains some advertisement of a Bible, published in numbers, and accompanied with the notes and illustrations, not only of the old Calvinistic divines, but also of their *soi-disant* evangelical successors, and which answer the purpose of rendering what is plain difficult, and what is difficult unintelligible, I think something of a similar plan, but of far different execution, yet remains to be attempted. I would suggest the propriety of publishing a bible which should contain the best notes of the best commentators, together with all the *material* variations in the translations which have been made by the ablest scholars. The work to be published in as cheap a form as consistent with the essentials of good paper and type, and to come out either in numbers or parts. That such a work would meet an extensive sale I cannot doubt. It would be valuable to the scholar, and to the unlearned christian most valuable.—If the above suggestions should meet the eye of any person or persons who might be thence disposed to undertake the publication of such a work, it would much gratify

Your obedient Servant,
A BIBLE CHRISTIAN.

Further Account of Thomas Aikenhead.

March 1, 1813.

Sir,

Since I sent you the letter which you inserted, p. 108, I have found in the Library of the London Institution, a Volume in Quarto, entitled, " A Collection and Abridgment of Celebrated Criminal Trials in Scotland, from 1536, to 1784, with Historical and Critical Remarks by Hugo Arnot, Esq. Advocate. Edinburgh, 1785." At p. 324, is the following information :—

" Thomas Aikenhead appears to have been about 20 years of age; his father who had been a surgeon in Edinburgh was dead. Sir James Stewart, his Majesty's Advocate, by special order of the Privy Council, served him with a criminal indictment, before the court of Justiciary, for blasphemy. (Records of Justiciary, Dec. 23, 1696.) The libel sets forth, that blasphemy against God, or any of the persons of the blessed Trinity, *or against the holy scriptures, or our holy religion*, is a crime of the highest nature, and severely punishable by the laws of God, by those of this and every well-governed realm, and particularly, by Act of Parliament, 1696, Sess. 5. Ch. 11.

"That, notwithstanding, the prisoner had repeatedly maintained, in conversation, that theology was a rhapsody of ill-invented nonsense, patched up, partly of the moral doctrines of philosophy, and partly of poetical fictions and extravagant chimæras. That he ridiculed the holy scriptures, calling the Old Testament, Ezra's fables, in profane allusion to Æsop's fables. That he railed on Christ, saying, he had learned magic in Egypt, which enabled him to perform those *pranks* which were called Miracles.

" That he called the New Testament the History of the impostor Christ. That he said Moses was the better artist, and the better politician; and he preferred Mahomet to Christ. *That the Holy Scriptures were stuffed with such madness, nonsense, and contradictions, that he admired the stupidity of the world in being so long deluded by them.* That he rejected the mystery of the Trinity as unworthy of refutation; and scoffed at the incarnation of Christ, saying, that a *Theanthropos*, or Godman, was as great a contradiction as a *hirco-cervus*, or goat-stag, or that a *quadratum* was a *rotundum*. That he laughed at the doctrine of redemption. That he said the notion of a spirit was a contradiction. That he cursed Christ, and argued against the being of God, maintaining, *that God, the World, and Nature, are all one thing;* and that the world existed from all eternity. That he said the inventors of the scriptural doctrines would be damned, *if there was such a thing as rewards or punishments after this life;* and that christianity itself would soon be extirpated. That his impiety was so audacious, that, as he passed by the Trone Church, in a cold night, he said to a companion, he could wish to warm himself in the place Ezra called hell; and *lastly*, that he often uttered these or the like speeches within the last twelvemonth, without provocation, and merely from malice against God and Christ.

"The Court found the railing against, or cursing any of the Trinity, relevant to infer the pains of death; and the other crimes relevant to infer an arbitrary punishment.

"No counsel appeared for the prisoner; nor does it seem that one word was urged in his behalf during the course of the trial. Four or five witnesses were examined, one of them a writer in Edinburgh, the rest students at the University, lads from 18 or 20 to 21 years of age. They proved most of the articles of the libel, with this addition, that the prisoner said, he was confident Christianity would be utterly extirpated by the year 1800. There was however a material defect in the evidence. The article most highly criminal, viz. the railing against God and cursing our Saviour, was not proved at all, but was an inference drawn by the jury from the prisoner's cursing Ezra, and saying, that the inventors of the scriptural doctrines would be damned, if there be such a thing as damnation.

"The jury unanimously found the prisoner guilty of railing against God, railing at and cursing Christ, and of the whole other articles in the libel. The verdict was returned and sentence pronounced against the prisoner on *Christmas eve*, 'To be taken to the Gallow-Lee, on the 8th of January, between the hours of two and four in the afternoon, and to be hanged; his body to be buried at the foot of the gallows, and his moveable estate to be forfeited.'"

The compiler of this collection observes, that "five persons summoned on the jury refused to attend." He adds, after several just and liberal remarks, "Mercy was asleep, as well as justice and science; so the dreadful sentence was executed!" It is indeed very difficult to give credit to all the horrid charges against *Aikenhead*. Several passages appear like malicious distortions of rash speeches, which might have escaped a needless youth, in the unguarded moments of conviviality among his gay companions. This instance of Protestant persecution unto death, eight years after the *Revolution*, does not appear to have been considered as any thing remarkable. It is not even mentioned in *Maitland's History of Edinburgh*, among the events of that period.

R.

Remaining Funds of the Hackney College.

Laurumney, near Newport, Monmouthshire, Dec. 27, 1812.

SIR,

I doubt not, that all persons who, like myself, consider it of great importance that young men of respectable fortune and family should not be compelled to resort, for the completion of a liberal education, to institutions where either authority or prejudice has ordained that the young and the ingenuous mind shall, on its entrance, be subjected to trammels which neither reason nor religion sanction, will participate in my satisfaction on the perusal of the following passage from Mr. Belsham's most interesting Memoirs of the late excellent Theophilus Lindsey.

Speaking of that ill-fated, but nobly-intended institution, Hackney College, (whose ill fortune it was to exist about that memorable period, when the pestilential effects of long and galling tyranny, both civil and religious, exploded in the premature and retaliatory shape of the French Revolution,) —Mr. B. says, the principal of the debt incurred on its account "has been long since discharged, and by the accumulating interest of the residuary funds, during the suspension of the institution, under the management of the worthy and respectable treasurer, John Towgood, Esq. a sum has been raised sufficient to discharge the interest of the debts, and to deliver the College honourably and faithfully from every just demand upon its assets. A considerable permanent fund still remains, agreeably to the resolution of the General Meeting, July 1st, 1786, which, it is hoped, will soon be placed in the hands of proper trustees, and vested in public securities, the capital to continue inviolable and unalienable, and the dividends to be applied to the education of students for the ministry, either, as is most desirable, in some institution in the vicinity of the metropolis, or at some other academical institution in England or Wales."

From this account it evidently appears, that there are still funds remaining, from the application of the income of which and from the probable liberal contributions of the friends to free and well-principled education, a hope of essential benefit to the rising generation and to society may yet be fostered. The particular object of my present letter is to draw the attention of your readers and the public to this incalculably great object, and at the same time to request farther information from those who are capable of affording it, through the medium of your pages. About the time of the closing of the College (if my recollection serves me) a very considerable legacy was bequeathed, on certain conditions, for similar purposes to those unhappily frustrated by the failure of that undertaking: the public will feel interested also in knowing how that was, and in general what funds there are in existence, at present unapplied, which are capable of being devoted to the purposes of liberal education amongst Dissenters. Though our fathers failed in the success of their well-meant and liberal endeavours, it by no means necessarily follows, that the same fatality should attend the exertions of their sons in the same good cause, nor will this want of success on their parts afford rational excuse for our supineness.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
JOHN H. MOGGRIDGE.

Mr. R. Astley on Mr. Frankland's Pupils.

Halifax, Feb. 22. 1813.

Sir,

The List of Mr. Frankland's Pupils, which was given to the public in some numbers of your Repository for the year 1811, notices only 105. I am in possession of a MS. of Mr. Oliver Heywood's, which completes the list of "Scholars that have been under Mr. Richard Frankland's tuition from 1669 to 1698, with the times when they were admitted." This list furnishes the names of 304 pupils. After Mr. Richard Frankland's death, Mr. Heywood says, "That academy was broken up, the scholars dispersed. Not long after, Mr. John Chorlton set up a teaching university-learning in a great house in Manchester, Lanc. The names of his scholars are these," &c. giving a list of 19.

Perhaps your correspondent P. may be able to complete for your Repository the list he has already begun. If not, I shall be happy to supply the deficiency.*

I am, &c.
RICHARD ASTLEY.

Extracts from a Religious Correspondence.

Sir,

We are often told that Unitarianism is a "region of ice; that it freezes up every affectionate sentiment towards the Deity, and leaves to its votaries nothing but a dry, philosophical view of his providence, in which any perception of his notice of their individual concerns is instantly lost in the immensity of the divine plans." Unitarians, of course, deny the justice of such an inference, and contend, that the views which they (upon what appear to them, scriptural and reasonable grounds) entertain of the character of the Almighty are the only ones from which comfort can be reasonably derived. An appeal to facts is the best way of determining such a subject as this, and, as one proof of the superior efficacy of Unitarian views in this case to such as are usually dignified with the name of orthodox, I send you some extracts from a recent real correspondence, in which the *experience* of the writer has very satisfactorily settled the matter. I shall be glad, with your permission, to see these extracts in an early number of your eminently impartial and useful work, and am your constant reader, B.

---

* We are obliged to Mr. Astley for his offer, but we declined the continuation of the List referred to, on the remonstrances of several of our readers, as being uninteresting and useless. Ed.

July 22, 1810.

How peculiarly does public worship help to give firmness to the feet in the journey of life.

The only safe way to counterbalance the various trials of life is to cultivate that entire dependance on the wisdom and goodness of God, which alone can ensure solid peace of mind. To my feeble apprehension, the principles of Unitarianism are the *only ones* that can enable one to do *this*, for they are the only ones which represent the Deity *as he is*, a being *worthy* of our confidence. Certain it is, that *I* never felt either much love to or confidence in God before I was a Unitarian, and that the more I thought of his SUPPOSED plans of providence, the more each of these sentiments towards him abated in my mind; till at last I dreaded, if I contemplated religion too much, that I should lose all sense of it. But *now*, that a juster view of things is before me, I can praise my God with my whole soul, and every night and morning pray for entire acquiescence with his divine will, and with a perfect reliance on his all-efficacious mercy. I used to be gloomy and melancholy in all my expectations, and in the general train of my ideas. Thinking I lived under the sway of a morose and implacable tyrant, I never could comprehend, that there was any thing but arbitrary perverseness in having called me into being at all. I may now say, I am not the same creature that I once was. So much do I feel all this, that I cannot *now* imagine how a reflecting Trinitarian *can* be comfortable; or a Unitarian, under any circumstances, except very uncommon ones indeed, perfectly miserable.

I agree with you in what you say on the doctrine of redemption: but why do we Unitarians, not believing in the *common* notion concerning it, call Jesus Christ "our Saviour?" Our *teacher*, divinely inspired, he certainly was: but does not *Saviour* mean something *more*, and is not our using the term as we do, implying an acquiescence in the abominable doctrine of a sacrifice for our sins?—a doctrine the source of so much impiety in the world. The more I think on the subject, the more I incline to an opinion which came into my head about eleven months ago, viz. that God, for all-wise reasons, means to keep the Jews a distinct people, and that, as he generally uses common moral means to effect his purposes, he has employed the doctrines of Trinitarianism for this end; their introduction has been like a wall wound seven times round this people, to keep them alone in the midst of the Christian world. Had Unitarian Christianity continued from the first, there would not have been such a thing in this globe as a Jew.

March 9, 1811.

I am sure you will hear with pleasure, that during all my late sufferings, I have been greatly supported, my mind has always been calm, and more than resigned, for it has been contented. But a Unitarian, who sees the God of LOVE in every dispensation has supports and comforts unknown to less sublime systems of religion. Yes! *our* Christianity *is* the religion of consolation.

Dec. 10, 1812.

The entire absence of all religious conversation at ——— was an evil, and the want of religious instruction a still greater one. THAT was the *sore evil.* With religion constantly in the mind, we must improve: but when every thing occurs to shut it out, we must lose every good and comforting impression. I write in haste; but before I close, let me add the following humble effort of my muse on my favourite subject: *The universal acceptance and salvation of* ALL SORTS *of beings, at the end of all things.* I have endeavoured to generalize every thing as much as possible.

Universal Unitarian Hymn.

The *Soul* of the *world* ALL its homage must claim,
Unrivall'd, alone! *First* and *Last* is his name:
The Fountain of life let all living implore,
Creation's CREATOR, Creation adore!

The God of all *love* form'd life to be blest;
The God of all *power* conducts all to rest.
Through worlds and through ages both here and to come,
ALL BEING *refines* till it reaches its home.

When suns are all sunk, worlds on worlds are decay'd,
And spheres yet unformed their last circuits have made;
To *crown* all the works of Omnipotent's hand,
All rational nature ACCEPTED shall stand.

With powers now untried, with affections refin'd
With raptures and joys now unknown to mankind,
One vast Hallelujah of worship and praise,
To the SOURCE of all being, All Being shall raise.

On the Decline of Presbyterian Congregations.

Liverpool, Aug. 15, 1812.

SIR,

The great changes that have of late years taken place in many of the congregations among that sect of Christians, commonly denominated Presbyterians, is a subject which has often and deservedly engaged the attention of some of the writers and supporters of your useful miscellany. Various and opposite are the causes assigned for the decay of rational religion, and the substitution, in its place, of Methodism and Calvinistic rant. Far be it from me to suppose, that I have discovered any thing at all tending to decide the point; but still, as your pages are open for the reception of whatever may lead ultimately to good, by renewing a most important subject, I trust my motive will be rightly construed, if I make a few observations. For my own part, I cannot but confess, that the experience of the past year, has done more to convince me of the real cause, than all the arguments I had before heard. We have in this town been so situated as to have an opportunity of hearing frequent addresses from ministers, from various parts; many of them men, whose talents and attainments would at once command esteem and admiration. But how much is it to be lamented, that while we listen with delight to the language and subject of the minister, in most instances we can have little or nothing that should recommend and dignify the *preacher*. Often with heartfelt sorrow have I looked around me in vain for that attention which is shewn when the heart is touched by the animated glow infused into it by the persuasive voice of eloquence. Surely then there must be something radically wrong in the education of our ministers. Would to heaven that I could look forward and say, that the time is coming when even this cause of our decline will be counteracted. But painful it is to be obliged to entertain the idea, that while our young Ministers are receiving educations that would enable them to employ the gifts of oratory to the best possible advantage, they are either altogether neglecting the cultivation of this talent, or paying only secondary attention to that, which, while society remains in its present formation, is of primary importance. Who that has the smallest share of sensibility, would not be more than doubly gratified, by the addition of the charms of eloquence, to a well written sermon? But let us look at the majority of many congregations. Are these most likely to be attracted by the language or manner of the preacher? There are those doubtless, who say, that the judgment of such is not to be regarded, and consequently we may presume, that it matters but little, in their estimation, to what particular doctrine they listen. These reasoners may, or may not care what becomes of the less informed orders of society, but certain it is, that those portions of most congregations, likely to be caught by the allurements of sound, have already been ensnared by the greater attractions of other sects. Here I must remark, that it is a fact, that wherever one of our ministers has settled, who was to a certain degree possessed of those powers of elocution, so necessary to attraction, our cause has flourished, and several instances might be pointed out, where the numbers have been more than doubled. On the other hand, we have lost ground in the same ratio where, (whatever were his other merits) the minister has not been recommended by certain outward graces. I am not vindicating noise or rant, in thus giving an opinion, but I affirm, that unless some steps are taken to apply genuine eloquence to the support of one of the best of causes; that kind of oratory which has already so thinned many of our congregations, will still continue to draw from us at least a portion of those whose opinions are not firmly fixed. There are doubtless different views of the mode of cultivating the powers of eloquence, but I can hardly suppose that any will agree that the plan now pursued at one of our institutions, to which we are constantly referred as the future support of our cause, is likely to effect much, while the students are accustomed to trust so little to memory. Can a minister whose eyes are constantly fixed on a book during prayer, be so able to command attention, as one who is free from the constraint to which this must subject him. But facts are after all, what must be relied upon, and who that knows the result of the late examination in the department of elocution, at the institution before alluded to, will persist in the support of such a system? To the decision of the previous year, it would be painful, and is perhaps unnecessary to refer.

I am, Sir, &c.

HENRY TAYLOR.*

---

* Unwilling to give insertion to statements and allusions which must offend some of our readers, we at first declined publishing the above letter, which was sent to us under the signature of *A Constant Reader;* but the writer having since given us his name, we cannot

Decline of Presbyterian Congregations.

Sir,

In your former volumes you have discussed the subject of the decline of Presbyterian Congregations; and you have assigned many probable concurrent causes of the humiliating fact. But there is one, not as I remember hitherto brought forward, which has always appeared to me more operative than any other, and that is—the mean provision which is commonly made for the ministers in this denomination, whose salaries are not upon an average sufficient to support them comfortably in the lowest rank of life; while they are at the same time expected to appear as gentlemen and fit companions for the best company which their auditors receive.—“How do I make this undeniable fact bear upon the case?” Thus.—The knowledge of the painful, genteel poverty of Presbyterian ministers prevents aspiring youths, likely to make a figure, from looking to the ministry; and prudent ministers dissuade their sons from the profession. If, however, very able men get into the ministry, they, in many cases, make their profession subordinate to some other occupation, chiefly that of education or authorship, and, in some few, retreat into the world, where they figure as physicians, lawyers, bankers, merchants, chemists, sugar-bakers, ironmongers, razor-sellers, or book-venders. Those that remain in the profession, with a few exceptions (in the cases of literary reputation not wholly incompatible with the ministry, of celibacy, or of a buoyancy of talent that no disadvantages can repress,) groan and go on, dispirited, tame and unable to make any popular exertions. Congregations complain, but they first starve the vital spirit of an honourable, generous man, and then reproach him with the want of energy.

“It is not so, it may be said, “with the orthodox.” In many cases it is; but probably their habits and expectations do not so generally incapacitate them for poverty. Their ministers oftentimes unite lucrative trades with their Sunday's calling. Besides that their influence with their people and their familiar intercourse with them put them in the way of many gratuities which a Presbyterian minister knows not how either to expect or to receive. A printed sermon is to an evangelical minister a handsome fee; to a presbyterian a heavy tax.

“The remedy!”—Plain.—Presbyterians! either shut up your places of worship, or do more for your ministers. The sum which ye expend upon one gay winter party, converted into an annual subscription to your meeting-house, would be sufficient to alter the state of things in your denomination. Ye will not alter in this respect, but whilst your interest as members of a once respectable religious body is sinking, do not at least blame your poor ministers, to whose self-denial ye owe it that your consciences have a gratification once a week.

I say nothing of opinions, because I believe that the liberal opinions of Presbyterians in any form, whether Sabellian, Arian,

---

refuse a place to his communication, consistently with our profession of a determination to encourage free discussion. **Editor.**

or Unitarian, would be quite efficacious, if their ministers were encouraged and empowered to hold up their heads and to lift up their voices.

For the freedom of these few sentences I make no apology, being

THE SON OF A PRESBYTERIAN MINISTER.

Prayer of an Unbeliever.

SIR,

Liberality of sentiment has ever appeared to me to be a prominent feature in the character of Unitarian ministers; that they should therefore assume as a truth (which appears to me to be the case), in common with the most illiberal and prejudiced champions of Christianity, that immorality and pride are almost invariably the parents of infidelity, has I confess excited my astonishment. Did not his religion teach him to suppress it, a real Christian would feel indignation at having his motives and conduct classed with those of the herd of professing Christians; and upon what pretence does he confound the genuine and the professing infidel? If in the investigation of truth, circumstances over which he had perhaps no controul, have fortunately led the Christian to the adoption of a faith replete with the most powerful motives to virtue, to the excitement of the most sublime and delightful feelings, and to the most soothing consolation under every affliction, he should surely pity, and not condemn the man, who, in an ardent and disinterested pursuit of the same object, has unfortunately, but irresistibly, taken a more gloomy path. Influenced by a wish to remove a prejudice unworthy of the respectable class to which these observations refer, I send you a prayer which fell by chance into my hand; it proceeded from the pen of an infidel, and he had I understand been for some time in the daily habit of using it. Should you give me that credit for purity of motive, which I deserve, you will I think allow it a place in your Repository.

A LOVER OF JUSTICE.

Oh! Thou eternal Author, Preserver and Governor of the world, teach me to know thy will, and enable me to perform it. Teach me to love thee, to fear thee, to serve thee, and to obey thee as I ought. If the Christian religion be indeed of divine origin, if it contains doctrines and precepts which thou hast designed for the belief, the consolation, and the direction of man, enlighten my understanding, and prepare my heart, that I may be enabled to perceive its truth, to feel its power, and to act up to its divine injunctions. Should pride, should prejudice, should attachment to any worldly object have so enveloped me with darkness, as to render me incapable of perceiving this heavenly communication, dissipate, Oh, God! those clouds, that the rays of this divine light may penetrate and convince my understanding; but if reason be alone the light which thou hast destined for my guide, illumine that reason, assist me to correct it where it is erroneous, to humble it where it is presumptuous, and so to regulate it, that it may lead me to the knowledge, and to the practice of duty. May it teach me the necessity of restraining every impatient, every selfish, every indolent feeling, of cultivating the virtues of resignation, humility, piety, fortitude, self-denial, charity, and universal benevolence; but by my own efforts, I feel I can do little. Oh! grant me thy divine assistance in the regulation both of my understanding and my heart; diffuse through that heart every kind affection; may love to thee, and love to all mankind become constant inmates there, and under their influence may I perform all the duties which thou requirest of me. May I not, Oh, God! be alone solicitous for my own virtue and happiness, but for the virtue and happiness of those also whom thou hast committed to my care, of all with whom I am connected, and over whom I have any influence: assist me in the arduous task of their improvement, ameliorate their hearts, and prepare their minds for the reception of truth, religion, virtue, knowledge and happiness. May they be enabled, by thy assistance, to pursue with undeviating step the path of duty, unappaled by difficulty, unseduced by temptation. Let not, Oh God! discontent and sorrow for blessings and advantages denied, tempt me to arraign thy justice, or render me insensible to those which are still within my reach; but may I accept them with gratitude, and endeavour to make a proper use of them. O grant me discernment to discover my own faults, patience to contemplate, and fortitude to conquer them. If man can have the power of acting in opposition to the will of his omnipotent Creator, and thereby sinning against thee, I have undoubtedly sinned, and if so I would humbly implore thy gracious pardon for my past offences, and most ardently solicit thee to make the path of duty clear to me in future, and assist me steadily to keep it. I thank thee, Oh God! for the protection thou hast afforded me the night past, that thou hast preserved me from danger, refreshed me with sleep, and awakened me with a disposition of mind to hold communion with thee; may this intercourse become every day more interesting, more frequent, more efficacious; may it teach me to look up to thee with confidence, as my father and my friend, and may this confidence produce all those soothing effects on my mind which it is calculated to produce. Inspire me, Oh God! with a perfect conviction of thy superintending providence, and may I learn from thence, in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content. Take me, I beseech thee, under thy protection this day, preserve me, if it be thy good will, from every bodily and mental evil, and assist me in restraining every propensity, disposition, feeling and wish, which may be inimical to my own virtue and happiness, and the virtue and happiness, of those with whom I am connected. May I, at the conclusion of this and every future day, be conscious of having made some progress in the attainment of all those virtues of which thou hast rendered human nature susceptible, that I may be at length prepared to quit this scene of trial and of suffering, and to enter into whatever future state of existence thou mayest see fit to call me to. I would wish to commit myself and all that belong to me, to thy fatherly care and good providence. Oh! that this wish were accompanied with a perfect conviction, that all is ordered by unlimited power, goodness and wisdom, and that all will terminate in universal happiness.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

Mr. Cappe on the Miraculous Birth of Christ.

[Continued from p. 41.]

SIR,

Although I did not consider myself as at liberty to publish the whole of the papers on the miraculous birth of Christ, which the author himself, though repeatedly urged to it, had declined publishing, yet as some curiosity had been excited on the subject, I felt it incumbent upon me to send an outline of the result to your valuable miscellany; and that for the object, principally, of proving, that the commonly received opinion may be abandoned, even by minds not deficient in piety, learning or critical acumen, without giving up the authenticity of the disputed chapters.

The first reflection or practical inference deduced by Mr. Cappe, I have already transmitted, I now go on to send you the remainder; and am, with the most sincere wishes that the Monthly Repository may long be the vehicle of disseminating valuable and important truth,

Sir,
Your obliged servant,
CATH. CAPPE.

REFLECTION II.

" Passages of scripture capable of such contrary interpretation, cannot contain in them doctrine necessary to salvation, if by that be meant divine acceptance and the final happiness of men. It was a part of the Mosaic economy and a special duty of the Jewish people to receive their promised king. To this, they were bound by the requisitions of their own law, and the injunctions of their own prophets: excision was denounced against those who should reject him, preservation was promised in the midst of it to those who should receive him; and in respect to *this* salvation to *this* people, in respect to *this* duty, there were no other means of safety, but by believing Jesus to be the Christ, by receiving him as the Messiah. If they believed not Jesus to be the Christ, in respect to this world, they were ruined; i.e. they were treated on the principles of their own economy, which was founded on national and temporal sanctions, yet, notwithstanding, this secular punishment did not decide their future fate; *they*, if they honestly rejected Jesus upon their best judgment, after serious and diligent enquiry, and were at the same time, of general good character, though damned (as our version speaks) in this life, would be saved, accepted and made happy in a better.····Admitting, what most certainly scripture no where advances, that the belief of some certain truths is necessary to divine acceptance and future happiness, yet, surely, God, " who will have all men to be saved," cannot have shut up these necessary and essential truths, in terms and passages of scripture, which, not to insist that they ought to be interpreted in a sense different from that in which the belief of them is most commonly made the indispensble condition of salvation, yet which passages, to say the least, *may* be interpreted in a different manner, plausibly interpreted so, and the interpretation supported by such arguments as might well stagger a very competent judge, and would create lasting doubt and fluctuation, in more indecisive minds. If any truths must of necessity be believed in order to be happy in a future life, one should think they must be plain, simple truths; plainly, simply and incontestibly revealed, capable of affecting the sentiments of the heart, and, if remotely, yet importantly, connected with the conduct of the life. To whomsoever revelation is obscure, to *them* in such passages it cannot be useful, and therefore cannot be necessary. Where you have not either faculties or furniture of mind to qualify you for the understanding of it, you need not disturb yourselves about it: in those instances and passages it will make no article in your account.

"III. Though to Christians strong in faith, of comprehensive and enlightened minds, no danger may result from doubts concerning the genuineness of this or the other passage of the Christian scriptures; though *they* may bear the defalcation of some, without attainder of their belief and respect, as to the rest; yet many, and some not weak Christians neither, would find offence in such liberties, and might be tempted, having given up some parts, the external evidences of the truth and genuineness of which, were equal to those of the truth and genuineness of any that were left; having done this, might easily be tempted to do more, and to give up all. He whose ideas of Christianity, its nature, end and objects are the truest, i.e. the simplest, will be least of all in this danger.—But, although it must be admitted, that such obscurity or apparent inconsistency as may put it out of our power to interpret, must also put it out of our power to use, and therefore takes whatever of scripture has this character out of our account; yet it does not, in like manner, take the passage out of the book; so far from proving, it does not of itself even afford an equitable presumption, that it is not as genuine as the rest. Difficulties that have not yet been removed, and apparent inconsistencies that have not yet been reconciled, may be removed and reconciled, and passages, therefore, that have not yet been understood, may be understood hereafter, and being understood, may become, in some respect or other, either to the interests of truth, or more immediately to the conduct or comfort of mankind, valuable and useful. However, obscurity and inconsistency are not forgery and fiction; these characters have been charged on true and genuine writings, and yet in time, every trait of this sort has wholly disappeared. Not to be able to interpret a passage, or to relish the contents, is not to overthrow the testimony of antiquity concerning it, and will not justify its erasement from the canon of legitimate writings.

"With respect to the two first chapters of Luke's Gospel in particular, I find in them no internal traces of forgery or fiction, but many of genuineness and truth. Here are no mistakes, here is nothing inconsistent with manners or with facts, nothing that accords not as well as truth could accord, with all we know of what went before and of what followed this narrative: every thing that is ascribed to every character, whether word or deed, is perfectly natural and proper. The narratives of Matthew and of Luke are both forged if either is, they agree perfectly together, and they reciprocally elucidate and support each other; e. g. Luke's story of the annunciation explains and supports Matthew's narrative in his 18th verse, and his story of the angel's address to Joseph, in the 20th; and the subject of Mary's joy, in the 48th verse of Luke, is explained and illustrated by what we find of Joseph's state of mind concerning his purpose, and his change of purpose in the 19th and 24th verses of Matthew. Some things in the narratives are of such a nature, that they were likely to bring the whole into controversy: such as an ingenious forger would have avoided, as improbable; such as would hardly have presented themselves to his imagination, or if they had, such as he would have rejected, lest they should discredit his fiction. Of some it was not probable that they should be either intended or undertaken, nor was it within the compass of human power, to bring them about. e. g. The journey to Bethlehem with Mary, so far advanced in her pregnancy, was not a thing that Joseph could be supposed to chuse, and, if it had been in his desire, that this character of the Messiah, *that he should be born in that place*, or that he should be born at the time of enrollment, should be accomplished in his son, it was not in his power to secure either of these points; these events, the one an essential characteristic of the Messiah, the other, useful and important in the discovery of his birth to the shepherds, appeared more like the real care of providence, and its powerful disposal and control, than the fictitious invention and studied management of man.—The story of Zacharias and Elizabeth, for the confirmation of Mary's faith in the angel's prophecy, seems neither natural or easy to imagine for the purpose; and had it been a fiction, the scene would not have been laid in a place so public, and under the observation of so many people; the circumstances would not have been made so numerous, so particular and so extraordinary, nor would it have been remarked that the transaction was noised abroad and made deep impressions on the minds of the whole country.—Again, as in these things there are hazards of detection, which a forger would not have incurred, so, also, in other instances, there is such wonderful propriety in numerous particulars, as would not have occurred to an impostor. For instance, the angel's message to the shepherds, considered as intended to engage their attention and belief, is most admirably proper; it is conceived in terms, all of them alluding to ancient prophecies of the Messiah, every one of which has singular pertinence and energy, and the whole shews circumspection, comprehension and attention of mind, which a forger would probably not have possessed: this, again, seems more like the care of Providençe, than the invention of a forger.

"I now proceed to add a reflection or two of another kind, viz.

"IV. If Jesus was the son of Joseph, then assuredly he was nothing more than man. Born of a virgin, miraculously formed by the power of God, he might have been nothing more than man; such Adam was, and there were in ancient as well as there are in modern times those who have entertained this opinion. Yet this is not the natural tendency of that idea: a miraculous conception leads the imagination to expect its progress to the production of something more than human.—

"Perhaps, had Jesus been universally conceived to be what the first Nazarenes and Ebionites conceived him to be, i. e. had these first chapters of Matthew and Luke been interpreted as we have now interpreted them, i. e. on true Jewish principles, Jesus would not at this day have had divine honours paid to him, nor been idolized under any name of God. Son of Joseph, undoubtedly in his nature he was nothing more than man: born of a virgin by the power of God, he might have been more than man, there would have been nothing absurd in the notion; sprung from Joseph he could not.

"V. It is remarkable that the doctrine of the miraculous conception, is not perhaps so perfectly innocent and indifferent a thing as some candid and liberal-minded christians may be willing to imagine. Perhaps it gave rise, certainly it gives support to the worship of a human being; it operates in favour of that portentous monster in theology, the doctrine of a triune God; and helps to shore up other doctrines as unphilosophical and illusive, and as perfectly without foundation either in reason or in fact. Through all these various means, this doctrine of the miraculous conception, contributes to deface the beautiful simplicity of the gospel, to impair its efficacy, to interrupt and to controul its salutary tendency and benign effects, and to throw obstacles into the way of its universal progress. But this is not all; this doctrine does still greater mischiefs; like all other unreasonable and unintelligible mysteries, it puzzles, perplexes, darkens and perverts the understandings of mankind; obscures and beglooms their views of God, of his works and of his providence; impairs their powers of discernment, and incapacitates them for free, impartial and accurate judgment in other instances; enfeebles their power to distinguish between truth and falsehood, and prepares them for the reception of as many follies and absurdities as any persons into whose way they fall, may chuse to impose upon them, under the mask of venerable mysteries, to be treated with religious reverence and awe; this it does in common with all other theological deceptions. But, moreover, there is a train of mischiefs more peculiar to itself; for if once it is conceived that Jesus was something more than man, there is no more guidance or encouragement to be derived from his example; nothing in him or relating to him but his teaching, will apply to us; the great object of the christian œconomy is totally defeated, and instead of being instructed in what we ought to do and concerning the excellence to which we may arrive, by the teaching, by the pattern, and in the instance of a man, of a brother of the human nature, an exemplar of what men ought to do, and a specimen of what they are to be, an example of the natural progress of human being in an individual of the kind; instead of having these great and desirable advantages, we have, what? instruction, and nothing more that is applicable to ourselves, for it is instruction from a Being of different origin and different constitution, whose example is not pertinent to us, from whose conduct, character, success and fortunes, we can deduce no inferences to ourselves.

"VI. If the phrase, 'is of the spirit,' necessarily denoted miraculous conception, then the idea that Jesus was the son of Joseph, it should seem, could not have obtained. It does not appear to me that the Ebionites and Nazarenes rejected any part of the beginning of Luke's gospel, and probably none of the gospel of St. Matthew, unless it were the genealogy; they therefore must have interpreted this phrase in some sense perfectly consistent with the natural conception of Jesus, whom they considered as the son of Joseph; and their interpretation, probably, was the true one. Of a book written in an ancient language, at the time, living, since dead, addressed to the bulk of the people, and therefore written in the popular language, the first and vulgar opinion concerning the import of terms, and phrases, will probably be the truest. Afterwards, when the language is gone into disuse, when the manners and circumstances of the people have undergone some considerable revolution, when peoples of different manners, of different languages, and different previous opinions are mixed with them, or have joined themselves to them in any sort of attention to such a book, or of labours on it; many sources of error respecting it are opened, and the applications at this time become more suspicious. The Nazarenes and the Ebionites were Jews, well acquainted with the Jewish language, and such jealous partizans, of the divine Unity, and of every thing connected with it, that if, in their opinion, the terms employed concerning the conception of Jesus, had carried in them any thing that appeared like the communication of divinity, they never could have been reconciled to the reception of the gospel.

How these early Jewish Christians interpreted 'of the Holy Spirit, &c.' I believe is not known, further than that they must have interpreted them in general in such manner as did not militate against the idea of his being by nature the son of Joseph. They, therefore, probably, must have given to the phrase some of the senses enumerated above, and supported by references to such passages of the Jewish scriptures remaining to us, as seem capable of shedding any light upon the subject. This language is very singular in many of its phrases and idioms, which foreigners, estimating the import of them by corresponding terms in their own language, must greatly misinterpret, and consequently must impute to the writers they undertake to explain, doctrines, opinions, and assertions, which they never made nor entertained. Take, for example, the Hebrew superlative formed with the name of God, the terms, 'judge,' 'make atonement,' 'make sin,' 'have a devil,' &c.* The phrase in question is of this class. When the gospel began to extend its conquests among the heathen, and converts were made from among them who read and interpreted the scriptures, perhaps when they first *heard* what was afterwards *written*, they annexed their own ideas to Jewish phrases, and explained them according to their own previous opinions. To a Jew, an unborn child, said to be 'of the Holy Spirit,' would not be said to be the offspring of the Holy Spirit, or to derive his descent from him; but these terms to a heathen, whose imagination was full of the stories of heroes descended from Gods born of human mothers, these terms, which they must perceive to be often used in the Jewish language to denote God himself, would naturally and instantly suggest the idea of a divine personage, from whom this future child was to be descended. This was the natural, and this was the actual order of these opinions. The first divinity or deity of Christ was a deity of nature, derived from the deity of his father, and naturally ascribed to him by heathen converts misinterpreting the Jewish phrase concerning his conception, and afterwards supporting this erroneous opinion by like misinterpretations of other Jewish phrases, such as 'God being in him,' 'doing the works,' his 'being one with the father,' &c. From the untenableness of this opinion on such ground (for Jewish language would not support heathen prejudices) another sort of divinity was invented for Jesus by these same heathen Christians, still more sublime, and more correspondent to their allegorical philosophy, equally suitable to their idolatrous propensities, and equally powerful to do away the ignominy of the cross of Jesus, and to exalt him in the opinion of the world. This divinity too was by generation, but not with the participation of a human parent; by spiritual generation from eternity by the great father of all things from himself. All these follies were later than the infancy of the gospel: they came from heathens, they could not come from Jews, the first converts to it, who would have been shocked at any thing that seemed to imply in it deity, or participation of deity, as may perhaps be thought to appear from that single instance in the 10th chapter of St. John, see also John v. 18. To call God *Father*, seems not to have been idiomatized so as to bear a sense equivalent to that in which *Son of God* was applied to magistrates, &c. At this latter phrase, whenever Jesus appropriated it to himself, the Jews took no umbrage; but to call God father (which however, they magnify into *own* father, *peculiar* father), is to deify himself, and excites their keenest indignation."

On the Genuineness of the Epistle to the Romans.

Sir,

I was pleased to find in your number for November, [VII. 696,] "Remarks on the Epistle to the

---

* See Genesis vi. 1—4, and consider the strange ideas and traditions that took their rise from mistaking the import of Jewish idioms in this passage.

Romans;" and more particularly because the writer proposed to notice "Mr. Evanson's Reasons for treating it as a Forgery." I am of opinion that a satisfactory reply to the objections Mr. E. has urged in his *Dissonance* against so large a portion of the New Testament, would be a most important service at this time; and I hope the attention of your correspondent and others will be directed more fully to this subject. At present, I cannot agree with the remark, that "Mr. Evanson's arguments are not very forcible in themselves either separately or collectively." Ever since I read his arguments, the genuineness of the Epistle to the Romans has appeared to me very doubtful, and those doubts are not removed by your correspondent. For the most capital objection of Mr. E. (if I remember right, for I have not the Dissonance now by me) he has not attempted to solve. It is this: The Epistle in question professes to have been written by Paul when he was carrying the contributions of the Gentile churches up to Jerusalem, i. e. about two years and a half before he was taken a prisoner to Rome. At that time it informs us that the church in Rome was so eminent, that its faith was spoken of throughout the whole world, and Paul longed to see them of whom he had heard so much, both for their profit and his own. See chap. i. 8—15. xv. 23—25. In the last chapter he desires salutation to more than twenty persons by name, besides many others referred to in general terms. It should also be remarked that Aquila and Priscilla are named among those who were at that period in Rome, and had an assembly of brethren in their house; the passage bears testimony to the distinguished zeal of these two worthy persons, and their attachment to the apostle. Chap. xvi. 3—5.

At the close of the Acts of the Apostles (which history is, I believe, universally ascribed to Luke, the constant companion of Paul, and who was an eye-witness of all the later transactions recorded in that Book), we are informed that Paul was conveyed a prisoner to Rome about two years after he had taken the contributions of the Gentiles up to Jerusalem. When he came to Rome he was permitted to reside in an hired house, under the custody of a soldier, and was not committed to close imprisonment. Having so much liberty, he sought intercourse with his own countrymen resident in Rome, but it does not appear that any one of them was a Christian. Nay, on the contrary, they are described as ignorant, unbelieving Jews, who actually did not know the peculiar doctrines of this new sect, only that a general prejudice was entertained against them: they were also unacquainted with the particular crimes alleged against Paul. On these topics therefore, they solicited information from him, and obtained it. But, as in every other case of the introduction of the gospel into a new place, many rejected it with contempt, whilst a few listened with candour and received it. Under these circumstances Paul continued two whole years, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ. There is not a hint given of his finding any Christian church at Rome, nor of his receiving the least attention or kindness from any Christian brethren in that city. This it must be acknowledged is passing strange, if the circumstances alluded to in the Epistle to the Romans, rather more than two years before, be correct.

If we credit the account given in the Acts, we are led to believe that the gospel was *first* preached at Rome by Paul himself, on the same ground as we consider him the first preacher of it at Philippi or Thessalonica. But on the contrary, if the Epistle to the Romans be genuine then we are bound to believe that there was a most eminent church at Rome before Paul visited that city, and with which he longed to have communion. Now at present it appears to me that both these accounts cannot be true.

By the "evidence usually produced for the genuineness of this Epistle," perhaps your correspondent refers to the fact that it was known and received among Christians towards the end of the second century. But that long before that date some letters were forged, and circulated in the apostles' name, even the New Testament itself bears record, 2 Thess. ii. 2. I do not say that the Epistle to the Romans was one of them; but I must see stronger arguments for its genuineness than those your correspondent has produced, before I can be *quite sure* it was written by Paul.

O.

December 24, 1812.

On Phil. ii. 5—9.

As to the exact interpretation of this passage, Unitarian expositors themselves are not agreed. But, since it is evident, that the mind or disposition, which was in Jesus Christ, is here recommended to the imitation of his followers; shall we not learn, with the greatest certainty, what was the temper which the Apostle exhorts the Philippians, (after the example of Jesus) to cultivate, by comparing it with that which he exhorts them to avoid? Now it appears to be the most prominent article of his admonition to them, ver. 3. "Let nothing be done through—vain-glory." The vain-glorious person, we know, is one who over-values himself, who assumes to himself a degree of consequence to which he has no proper title. In opposition to this character, the mind or temper of Christ Jesus was *humility;* of which it is impossible to give a more just definition than to say that it requires of every one, "not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think with sober-mindedness." (Rom. xii. 3.) Jesus "being in the form of God," appearing more like God than man, in consequence of the wonderful works which were wrought at his word or his prayers, in which all who saw them would naturally think that he was the sole agent, and therefore would regard and address him as something more than human, "did not think it a prize to be snatched at to be as (or, to be honoured as) God; but made himself of no reputation," of no account, endeavoured to turn away the regards of the people from himself, as if he were a mere nothing, by declaring that these works were effected by the power of the Most High, and not by any power resident in himself. The following words may, perhaps, be most justly interpreted as assigning the reason why he thus disclaimed the honour of these mighty works: "taking the form of a servant, being in the likeness of common mortals" (Lindsey's second Address to the University-Students, p. 289), and, therefore, knowing himself to be a common man, and not entitled to the honours which some were disposed to pay him. "And appearing only as an ordinary mortal" (ib.), and therefore knowing himself to be no more than such a one, "he humbled himself, and" (instead of claiming exemption from an ignominious death, on the ground of being superior in rank to those among whom he lived, or on account of the high privileges which had been conferred upon him, he) "became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore also," (as he did not advance any claim to the reverence and homage of others on account of the miracles which God wrought by him, but was content to be regarded and treated by them as what he really was, viz. a mere man like themselves, and in a very low and indigent condition, therefore also) "God hath highly exalted him:" thus illustrating and verifying his own well-known saying, "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted."

March 7, 1212. J. T. E.

Conjectural Emendation. John iii. 5.

Sir, *Nov.* 21, 1812.

I am well aware that I shall be accused of being an "arbitrary and licentious critic;" but charges, it must be remembered, are not proofs, and evidence remains evidence still.

John iii. 5. In the discourse of any other man than the great author of our faith, would the words "of water and" be esteemed genuine? I will point only to the *internal* evidence, leaving its effect to the reader. To my mind it is absolutely decisive, irrefragable. Were the autograph of the Evangelist in my possession and the words found there, my conviction, I am forward to avow, would only be fortified by the fact, that no human records are infallible.

I am, Sir,

J. T. C.

Illustrations of Scripture.

[From an Interleaved Bible.]

Gen. x. 2—4. *Dodanim* or *Rodanim.*—Some are of opinion that Rhodes was first peopled by the descendants of Dodanim, the fourth son of Javan. Both the Septuagint and Samaritan translation of the Pentateuch, instead of *Dodanim*, always use *Rodanim*; and by this appellation the Greeks always named the Rhodians.

Egmont and Heyman's Travels, i. 269, quoted in Dr. Clarke's Travels, Pt. II. § 1. ch. viii. p. 225.

REVIEW.

Still pleas'd to praise, yet not afraid to blame.—POPE.

ART. I. *Memoirs of the late Reverend Theophilus Lindsey, M.A. including a Brief Analysis of his Works, together with Anecdotes and Letters of eminent Persons, his Friends and Correspondents: also a General View of the Progress of the Unitarian Doctrine in England and America. By Thomas Belsham, Minister of the Chapel in Essex Street.* 8vo. pp. 568. 14s. Johnson and Co. 1812.

(Continued from p. 51.)

It is difficult for such as have always breathed the free air of liberal nonconformity to form a just estimate of the difficulties which a beneficed clergyman has to encounter, in making up his mind to break through the hindrances to liberty of conscience with which he is beset in an established church. There is something fearful in a change of opinions which must be followed by a total revolution in the habits, connections and prospects. Too much allowance, therefore, cannot be made for such ministers in the church as cannot command the resolution to quit a communion, in which their consciences are not wholly at ease; especially for such as, like Mr. Lindsey, evince by their future conduct that their temporary conformity does not proceed from an undervaluation of truth or an indifference to moral duty.

After Mr. Lindsey had resolved upon quitting the church, the execution of his purpose was for a short time delayed by an event, which is of so much importance in the religious history of the country that we shall follow Mr. Belsham in giving some account of it. We refer to the Association (called from its place of meeting, The Feathers' Tavern Association,) formed in the year 1771, for the purpose of making an application to Parliament to obtain relief in the matter of subscription; the mode of relief proposed was the substitution of a declaration of assent to the Holy Scriptures, in lieu of subscription to the thirty-nine articles and the Book of Common Prayer.

"The petitioners, though comparatively few in number, not amounting to 250, were of high consideration in point of talents, of learning and of moral worth. The names of Lindsey, of Blackburne, of Wyvill, of Jebb, of Law, of Disney, of Chambers, and many others are such as would do honour to any cause. The majority were clergymen, the rest were gentlemen of the professions, of law and medicine, who thus entered their protest against the yoke of subscription imposed upon students at the Universities, who had no view to the clerical office." (pp. 50, 51.)

The petition was presented to the House of Commons, on the 6th of February, 1772. The following account of the debate upon it is given by Mr. Belsham, in an extract of a letter from John Lee, Esq. who was afterwards Solicitor General, to a friend in the country, written the day after it took place.

"Sir Wm. Meredith in a few words informed the house, that he had in his hands a petition of a number of respectable clergy and others, praying relief in the matter of subscription, and therefore he moved that it might be brought up. Mr. T. Pitt seconded the motion. On this Sir Roger Newdigate rose up in great anger, and demanded to know what the contents of the petition were, and what the number and names of the men who had subscribed it. Sir William then read the petition in his place, and a few of the names, adding that the number was about 250. Sir Roger Newdigate then began the debate, and opposed with great vehemence the bringing up of this petition. In his opinion, it aimed at the destruction of the church, whose existence depended upon the continuance of the articles. Sir Roger spoke contemptuously of the number and quality of the petitioners, and sustained with great fortitude the character of member for Oxford. He was followed by Mr. Hans Stanley, who opposed the bringing up of the petition, as it tended to disturb the peace of the country, which, in his opinion, ought to be the subject of a 40th. article, which would be worth all the 39. He was succeeded by Mr. Fitzmaurice, who is brother to Lord Shelburne, and spoke on the same side, throwing out some very indecent reflections on the Confessional, and its author, and endeavouring to prove the petitioners to be a parcel of canting hypocrites, who under pretence of reformation, meant the ruin of our civil and ecclesiastical government. This conduct roused the resentment of Mr. Pitt, who with great dignity and good sense observed upon the indecency of calumniating any persons appearing in the character of petitioners for redress of grievances, more especially the persons then applying for relief in a matter that highly concerned the purity of religion, the integrity of their own minds, and even the morality of the people. He stated very well the principles of the reformation, and fairly inferred from them the propriety of the petition. The motion for bringing up the petition was also supported by Lord George Germaine, Mr Sawbridge, Mr. Thomas Townshend, Lord Cavendish, Mr. Dunning, Sir Henry Hoghton, Mr. Solicitor General Wedderburne, and Sir George Saville. I believe Sir George Saville's speech was one of the best that was ever delivered in that house. I can give you no idea of its excellence, unless by repeating some parts of it, when I have the pleasure of seeing you. I cannot help saying, however, that I never was so affected with or so sensible of the power of pious eloquence as while he was speaking. It was not only an honour to him, but to his age and country.—Mr. Solicitor General spoke very well, and gave a very handsome testimony to the character of Mr. Blackburne, as a learned, pious, virtuous and venerable man, and vindicated his book as an excellent and entertaining performance.—The speakers on the opposite side were Sir Roger Newdigate, Mr. Fitzmaurice, Lord Folkestone, Mr. Byrne, Lord North, Mr. Charles Fox, Mr. Burke, Mr. Dyson, Mr. Jenkinson, Mr. Stanley, Dr. Hay, and Mr. Cooper. Nobody but Sir Roger Newdigate attempted to defend the articles. And all the house explicitly declared it was foolish to require subscription at the university, and expressed a wish that it might be laid aside there.

"After a very fine debate, the house divided; the numbers for not receiving the petition were 217, for receiving it 71, which, considering the influence of the bishops and ministry, and the character and weight of the minority was thought a very great affair. The clergy petitioners were delighted with the debate, all of them that were in town being admitted to hear it. Dr. Hallifax, of Cambridge, was in the gallery, and seemed disappointed that his violent nonsense had produced so little effect on the house. This scene was acted yesterday, beginning at three, and ending at eleven o'clock." (pp. 54-61.)

The high character given by Mr. Lee of Sir G. Saville's speech is fully justified by an extract from it, as reported by Dr. Furneaux, which Mr. Belsham has inserted in a note: we cannot withstand the temptation to enrich our pages with this fine specimen of "pious eloquence."

"I must now, Sir, express my very great concern at the manner in which the petition, and they who signed it, have been treated. They have been treated in a manner very unparliamentary, in a manner that none should be treated who come to the bar of thi house to represent grievances and to so licit redress. Their characters have been aspersed: injurious suspicions have been thrown out against their designs and intentions. I wish many things not to have been said which have been said. The petitioners, Sir, are clergymen; men of respectable characters: I verily believe good and conscientious men. We may treat their situation with indifference, because we are strangers to it and feel not their difficulty. But let us for a moment put ourselves in the place of these petitioners, who are required to bring themselves under a solemn obligation on the one hand to preach according to scripture, (which, if it means any thing, must mean according to what they apprehend to be the sense of scripture,) and on the other, are required to declare their belief of articles which in their consciences they think contrary to the scripture, and which few will pretend to believe or to understand. . . . This, Sir, is a debate in which the honour of God, the interests of religion and virtue, our own consciences, and the consciences of others, are deeply concerned. Let us, then, hear no more of private characters, of Confessionals, and Feathers' Taverns. I have always thought that the *persons* of men who petition this house were under our protection. Their *characters* ought to be still more so. I therefore beseech you, I become an humble and earnest supplicant to you; by the benevolent spirit of the gospel, by all that is serious, I beseech you by the bowels of Christ, that this affair be treated, not as a matter of policy, not as a matter of levity, not as a matter of censoriousness, but as a matter of religion.

"Some gentlemen seem to apprehend that we are to make the doors of the church as narrow and to exclude as many as possible. I think we should make them as wide as we can to take in as many as possible. Others are apprehensive that, in case the Scriptures are substituted in the room of the articles, it will be the means of admitting into the church a great number of sectaries. Sectaries! Sir: had it not been for sectaries, this cause had been tried at Rome. Thank God, it is tried here.

"Some gentlemen fear that if we lay aside the articles and place the Scriptures in their stead, by throwing down all distinctions, we shall admit Papists, and together with them their religion too. But they forget that Papists are excluded by the oath of supremacy, and by the declaration against transubstantiation, against the invocation of the Virgin Mary and other saints, and against the sacrifice of the mass. And if any other test be needful, let them be made to acknowledge liberty of conscience and the right of private judgement; let them abjure persecution—that were a truly protestant test. But can any one seriously think that encouraging free inquiry and the study of the Scriptures will issue in the Romish religion? When I see a rivulet flow to the top of a high rock, and requiring a strong engine to force it back again, then shall I think that freedom of enquiry will be prejudicial to truth; then shall I think that liberty of judgment will be prejudicial to the protestant religion; then shall I think that adhering to the scriptures only will lead to Rome.

"Some gentlemen talk of raising barriers about the church of God, and protecting his honour! Language that is astonishing, that is shocking, that almost approaches to blasphemy. What! man! a poor, vile, contemptible reptile, talk of raising barriers about the church of God! He might as well talk of protecting Omnipotence, and raising barriers about his throne. Barriers about the Church of God, Sir? About that church, which, if there be any veracity in scripture, shall continue for ever, and against which the gates of hell shall not prevail? If I may be allowed on so serious an occasion to recollect a fable, it puts me in mind of one which I have met with, of a stately, magnificent, impregnable castle built on a rock, the basis of which was the centre of the earth, the top of it pierced the clouds, the thickness of the walls could not be measured by cubits. At the bottom of it a few moles were one day very busy in raising up a little quantity of earth, which when some mice saw, What are you doing, said they, to disturb the tranquillity of the Lord of this castle? We are not disturbing his tranquillity, replied the moles; *all blind as you are*, you may see that we are only throwing up a rampart to protect his castle.

"The Church of God, Sir, can protect itself. Truth needs not be afraid of not obtaining the victory on a fair trial. The lovers of truth will love all sincere inquirers after it, though they may differ from them in various religious sentiments. For it is to impartial and free

> inquiry only, that error owes its ruin and truth its success. Those who are penetrated with the benevolent spirit of the gospel will not condemn, as heretics, will not reject, as unworthy of their affection, any who believe the Christian religion, who search and endeavour to understand the Scriptures, though they may be unable to comply with creeds and articles.
>
> "Some gentlemen suppose that the Scriptures are not plain enough to be a rule and centre of union to the church. They must have articles and creeds to supply its defects. But if the things which are necessary to salvation are not plainly revealed, there is no way of salvation revealed to the bulk of mankind at all. Whatever is obscurely revealed will be always obscure notwithstanding our decisions. It can never be authoritatively determined by men. The only authority which can explain it, and make the explanation a test of faith, is the authority of God. As to what he has plainly revealed, it needs no articles to ascertain its meaning. We should not then adopt views and measures which are contracted and narrow. We should not set bars in the way of those who are willing to enter and labour in the church of God. When the disciples came to Christ and complained that there were some who cast out devils in his name, and said 'We forbad them, because they followed not us'—what did our Saviour do? Did he send them tests and articles to be subscribed? Did he ask whether they believed this, or that, or the other doctrine? Whether they were Athanasians, or Arians, or Arminians? No. He delivered that comprehensive maxim—'He that is not against me is for me.' Go ye and say likewise. (pp. 57—61.)

The associated clergy intended at one time to renew their petition in 1773, but the design was dropped, and the reformation of the church of England was abandoned, as hopeless. Mr. Lindsey, however, embraced the opportunity, afforded him this year, by his being called to preach the assize sermon at York, to bear his testimony to the cause of the petitioners.

To Mr. L. nothing now remained but to "deliver his soul" by retiring from the church. He dropped a hint of his design to his noble patrons of Alnwick Castle, whom about this time he visited by invitation; not without a hope, it should seem, that some pecuniary aid would have been rendered him; but in this he was disappointed, though he afterwards received a liberal present from his pupil, the present Duke of Northumberland, which was repeated annually till his decease. It was on the 12th. of November, 1773, that he notified to his diocesan, Dr. Markham, then bishop of Chester, afterwards Archbishop of York, his intention of resigning his vicarage. His letter on this occasion, together with the bishop's answer, and an extract from Mr. Lindsey's reply, are given in an Appendix to the volume. (pp. 500—504.) The correspondence may not do much honour to Dr. Markham as a biblical critic, but it reflects credit upon his temper and feelings. On the same day on which Mr. L. wrote his first letter to the bishop, he wrote, in the following terms, to his friend the Rev. Wm. Turner, of Wakefield, who had proposed to recommend him to a congregation of liberal dissenters at the Octagon Chapel, Liverpool, which was then in want of a minister.

> "I must ever say that I have had no such consolation from any one as from you, during the conflict and trial which the providence of God has cast upon me. You have ever been leading to the right point of view in which to consider it, and suggesting the most animating motives for encouragement under it. And not satisfied with doing this, your last convinces me of your earnest desire to contribute your endeavours to procure me an establishment when I quit this, which may preserve some degree of usefulness, which I anxiously wish, and

serve for that worldly support which we shall want. But with regard to what you kindly suggest, I believe it will be best to wait, and not lay out for any thing of this kind at present, though no less obliged to you than if you procured me success in it. My reason is, that my design, which I specify very particularly in my tract, is to try to gather a church of Unitarian Christians out of the Established Church. My hope is, that it may please Providence to excite some Philadelphians in our church to favour such a design. And when I go to town, which will be in the beginning of the winter, I shall do all I can to forward it; with hope, I said before, not very sanguine however, for serious religion is not the tone and temper of the times. But attempts must be made in such matters oftentimes when there are even greater improbabilities of accomplishing them. I could wish, and I think it my duty, to be instrumental in bringing those who are now in the darkness in which I was bred up, to the acknowledgment and worship of the One true God, through the mediation and according to the true doctrine of our Saviour Christ, rather than attach myself to those who are already emancipated from that darkness. And we are willing to expend what little we have for that end for a year or two in town, and make the trial. Should it fail, I should be glad to be useful in any congregation where the worship of the true God is allowed and professed. As to future provision, though gloomy thoughts for a moment have sometimes come across the mind, we have no doubt but our industry, and the friends that Providence will raise will furnish every thing needful for it.

"On Sunday last I took my leave of two of the chapels in my parish that lie at a good distance off, near the moors, a poor simple-minded people, who much affected me by the concern they shewed and expressed in words at my telling them that I should never more speak to them from that place; and all desired to have the little Tract which I mentioned I should distribute amongst them, and which would give them an account of the reasons why I left them." (pp. 81—83.)

[*To be continued.*]

ART. II.* *A Vindication of Religious Liberty. A Sermon, preached at Bridport, on Wednesday, June* 17, 1812, *before the Western Unitarian Society. By Robert Aspland.* Hackney, printed. Sold by Johnson and Co. and by David Eaton, London. 12mo. pp. 57.

The subject of this discourse cannot, alas! be pronounced unseasonable. Let our readers judge, whether, even at the present day, religious freedom is so clearly understood, so fully and readily allowed, and so consistently exercised, as it ought to be, by the professors of the gospel? We have cause of thankfulness, it is true, that we groan no longer under the spiritual tyranny by which our ancestors were enslaved: however, the progress of our age and country in the virtue of toleration, ill corresponds with its general improvement in arts and sciences; and many persons who have the *phrase* "religious liberty" on their lips, and who use it for the sake of pointing their sentences and adorning their paragraphs, seem almost total strangers to the *principle* and the *temper*.

Among these uninformed or hypocritical friends of the rights of conscience, Mr. Aspland is not to be ranked: his sermon is evidently the production of a sin-

---

[* This is one of a certain number of publications, which, for reasons obvious to our readers, we have not brought under review in the Monthly Repository. We depart from our rule in the present instance, at the desire of a friend, whose usual signature will be found at the end of the article; and influenced in no light measure, by the importance of the subject of the Sermon reviewed, at this crisis of religious bigotry. ED.]

cere, an enlightened and a feeling mind.

He begins with a perspicuous illustration of the connection and import of his text [Rom. xiv. 5.], and then shews, from the following considerations, that it was an essential part of the plan of our Lord, and his apostles, not to employ external force in the promotion of their doctrine, but to content themselves with laying their evidences before the world, and leaving men to form their own decision:—

"1st, The Christian religion cannot be promoted by external force, for it consists only in the belief of certain facts, the reception of some truths growing out of them, and the performance of some consequent acts of morality."—

"2d, The founders of our faith have laid down principles with which the use of force in matters of religion can never be reconciled.—

"3d, Although our Lord and the apostles predicted the spread and continuance of Christianity, they let fall no direction for taking religion under the patronage of the state; but, on the contrary, foreshewed, and not darkly, that by the assumption of unwarranted powers in the church, truth would be debased, and righteousness be well nigh exploded."—

The preacher next states and refutes objections to the unlimited and unmolested exercise of religious liberty, and concludes with a pertinent application of his remarks to the meeting, and to the object of the Western Unitarian Society.

Close and vigorous reasoning characterizes the discourse. The passage which we proceed to quote, is admirable, not only for the sound argument which it contains, but for its strong and happy reference to the actual situation of Catholic and of Protestant nonconformists.

"No one, it may be justly alleged, would now vindicate the use of fire and faggot in the service of the state religion. It is well to have advanced so far, and thanks to a good Providence for this improvement in the public mind! But persecution is not to be considered defunct because it is weakened. The spirit of persecution is this—to wish to inflict harm, or to take away good, on account of opinions. If no harm be inflicted, yet if good be taken away or denied, there is real, palpable persecution. A broader or a narrower, a deeper or a more superficial brand of disgrace may be impressed upon conscience; but the least opprobrium fastened on a faithful adherence to principle, is a result of the same evil mind that in other times, and under other circumstances, lighted up fires for martyrs. Virtue makes a man jealous of his reputation; when therefore the state puts a label on his faith, intimating that he is unworthy of trust, *it touches the apple of his eye*, it injures him in the most vital part; and, in the soreness of his feelings, shall he be still told that the stigma that he bears about is not persecution? Call it by what name you will, the spirit which suggests to one man the design of making another man's condition worse for his conscience is an evil spirit;"—pp. 18, 19.

There is no grosser sophism than *that* under which the opposers of the repeal of disabling statutes, would shelter themselves from the charge of persecution. "The real question at issue," say they, "concerns political power, and not the free exercise of religious worship." Their statement would be more correct, if for *political power* they substituted the words *political eligibility*. Now, between power and eligibility to power, there is a wide distinction: to be excluded from the former, may be the effect of personal caprice, of partiality, of favouritism, or of individual dislike and aversion; to be doomed, by an act of the community, to the other, what is it but *proscription*? Or we may reason thus:—Political eligibility is either honourable or a matter of indifference. If it be honourable, then to be rendered destitute of it, is a stigma. But if it be a subject of indifference, why should one class of men endeavour to retain it as a monopoly?

Mr. Aspland contends, with perfect justness and with no small ability, that the utmost freedom of speech should be allowed to unbelievers: and, in an Appendix, he fortifies his argument on this point, by appropriate citations from the works of Lardner, Simon Browne, Dr. Samuel Chandler, Dr. Sykes, Principal Campbell and Dr. Gerard; to which names we may add the high authority of Dr., afterwards Bishop, Lowth, who, in his Visitation Sermon at Durham, thus expresses himself respecting Christianity,

"It hath always flourished, or decayed, together with learning and liberty: it will ever stand, or fall, with them. It is therefore of the utmost importance to the cause of true religion, that it be submitted to an open and impartial examination; that every disquisition concerning it be allowed its free course; that even the malice of its enemies should have its full scope, and try its utmost strength of argument against it. Let no man be alarmed at the attempts of atheists or infidels: let them produce their cause; let them bring forth their strong reasons, to their own confusion: afford them not the advantage of restraint, the only advantage which their cause admits of: let them not boast the false credit of supposed arguments and pretended demonstrations, which they are forced to suppress. What has been the consequence of all that licentious contradiction with which the gospel hath been received in these our times and in this nation? Hath it not given birth to such irrefragable apologies and convincing illustrations of our most holy religion as no other age or nation ever produced? What, in particular, hath been the effect of unrestrained opposition in a very recent instance, prepared with much labour and study, and supported with all the art and eloquence of a late celebrated genius? Hath not the very weakness and impotence of the assault given the most signal and decisive victory to the cause of truth? And do not the arms of this mighty champion of infidelity stand as a trophy, erected by himself, to display and to perpetuate the triumph?"

The sermon from which we have made this extract, a sermon every way worthy of one who must be classed among the finest writers of his age, was preached in 1758, a very few years previous to which appeared, in five large volumes in quarto, the Posthumous Works of Lord Bolingbroke*, whom Dr. Lowth, no doubt, intends by the "mighty champion of infidelity."

Should Mr. Aspland's "Vindication of Religious Liberty," reach, as it well deserves, a second edition, he, probably, will not be indisposed to subjoin so memorable a plea for the extension of the rights of conscience: nor, perhaps, will he omit to place a note at the foot of his seventh page, for the purpose of informing the general reader, that the words adduced from the received version of the ninth chapter of Luke, are not admitted into Griesbach's text*.

---

* They were published, under the care of Mallet, March 6, 1754, which happened to be the day of Mr. Pelham's death; a coincidence that occasioned the following stanza in Mr. Garrick's Ode on the latter of these events:—

"The same sad morn, to church and state,
(So for our sins 'twas fix'd by fate)
A double stroke was giv'n;
Black as the whirlwinds of the north,
St. J——n's fell genius issu'd forth,
And Pelham fled to heav'n!"

Dodsley's Collection of Poems, vol. iv. and Boswell's Life of Johnson, (3d ed.) vol. i. pp. 231, 232.

N.

Art. III. *A Series of Letters to the Rev. J. Freeston: occasioned by his Tract, entitled a Serious Enquiry into the Nature and Effects of Modern Socinianism. With a Prefatory Address to the Baptist Congregations of the New Connection. By Joshua Toulmin, D. D.* 12mo. pp. 106. Birmingham; O. and H. Smith. London; Johnson and Co. 1812.

Dr. Toulmin has passed a long life in active and useful services to the cause of truth, and we rejoice to find that *his eye is not dim, nor his natural force abated*†—that he is still quick to discern, and strong to combat, bigotry and error. Our opinion of the pamphlet which has now called forth this veteran soldier of the Christian Faith, has been fully expressed in our last volume, pp. 518 and 711; but low as we rated it, we are inclined to believe that the writers who address the passions and prejudices of the vulgar, form a truer judgment of human nature than we have done, and on this ground we approve this second attempt to correct misrepresentations and to humble the pride of Protestant Popery. Our venerable author reasons pertinently; illustrates his arguments with useful appeals to historical facts; and *rebukes sharply*, but not uncharitably. It would be no disparagement of the present Letters, to say that they are scarcely equal to those by the same writer to *Andrew Fuller*; (for what life is sufficiently long for the production of more than one work, so original in its structure and so effectual in its operation?) but it may be confidently pronounced, within the limits of severe criticism, that they are more than sufficient for the purpose, and ought to carry conviction to the minds of any readers, who may have been imposed upon by Mr. Freeston's pretended reasoning and real bigotry.

Art. IV. *A Congratulatory Letter to the Rev. Herbert Marsh, D. D. F. R. S. Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge; on his judicious Inquiry into the Consequences of neglecting to give the Prayer-Book with the Bible; together with a Sermon on the Inadequacy of the Bible to be an exclusive Rule of Faith; inscribed to the same. By the Rev. Peter Gandolphy, Priest of the Catholic Church.* 8vo. pp. 70. Keating and Co. 1812.

Art. V. *A Letter to the Rev. Peter Gandolphy, in confutation of the Opinion that the vital Principle of the Reformation has been lately conceded to the Church of Rome: with a Postscript, containing Remarks on the Consequences which*

---

* See both his editions of the N. T. and Mon. Rep. v. 394.

† Deut. xxxiv. 7.

must result from the Concession of the Catholic Claims. By Herbert Marsh, D. D. F. R. S. Margaret Professor of Divinity in Cambridge. The 2nd Edition. 8vo. pp. 24, 1813.

There is nothing very important in this correspondence; we notice it solely on account of its singularity. Mr. Gandolphy, "a priest of the Catholic church," grateful to Professor Marsh, for the service which he considers him to have rendered to the Roman Catholic principle of the secondary importance of the Bible as a rule of faith, pours forth his feelings in a "Congratulatory Letter," which is headed by a *portrait of the Pope* (Pius VII.), before a crucifix, and followed by a sermon against the Protestant tenet of the sufficiency of scripture. The priest considers the Professor as a champion of the main principle of the Catholic faith, and seems almost to expect a speedy notification, of his conversion to the antient church. All this in seriousness! How mortifying to the Professor, who has imputed it to the unfairness of his Protestant antagonists, that his arguments have been pronounced Romish! His reply and vindication is marked by his usual acuteness, but we can scarcely forbear suspecting that it is not satisfactory to himself. It rests upon the distinction (which we shall be the last to find fault with,) between a *true* religion and an *established* religion, and the Professor's argument, as far as we understand it, [pp. 5—11.] is, that in his late publications he has not been defending *truth*, but the *establishment*,—if he had defended truth, he should have appealed not to the Liturgy and articles of the Church of England, but to the Bible.

In a *Postscript*, Professor Marsh declares himself against the Catholic claims, for some common, and some uncommon reasons. Protestant ascendancy is a part of the constitution (p. 21.); though we should have thought the constitution had been of prior date to Protestantism. The *mode* of preferring the Catholic claims is alarming; (p. 23.) in what mode could the oppressed complain, that would be agreeable to the oppressor? If the disqualifying statutes be repealed in favour of the Roman Catholics, they must *a fortiori* be dispensed with as to *Protestant Dissenters* (p. 24); a conclusion which not a little embarrasses the question of Catholic emancipation. But the Catholics "enjoy *toleration* in its full extent" (p. 23); strange allegation! It is still a capital offence by the laws of England, for a Roman Catholic to take part in the education of a Protestant child: and we believe that under certain circumstances, it is also a capital offence for a Roman Catholic priest to perform the functions of his office: we know that a few years ago a priest was condemned to perpetual imprisonment, and the Honourable James Talbot, a brother of the Earl of Shrewsbury, was tried for his life, for saying mass; the latter escaped conviction by want of evidence.

Art. VI. *Letters to a Young Dissenter on the general Principles of Nonconformity; containing free and candid Remarks on those Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of England, which appear objectionable to the nu-*

merous and respectable Dissenters of the present Day. By T. Drummond. 12mo. pp. 96. 2s. Johnson and Co. 1812.

The ground of dissent from the Church of England is considerably narrowed, by the growing liberality of the times: churchmen are not disposed to insist on the minutiæ of the hierarchy which scandalized our forefathers, and Dissenters have dropped many of their objections to the mere circumstantials of the Establishment. Still, however, a sufficient objection remains, on the part of the Dissenter, to any national church, whose laws and authority are necessarily inconsistent with that liberty of conscience. wherewith Christ hath made us free; and the Unitarian Dissenter has a further and stronger reason of separation—in the worship of the church, which is addressed to beings, whom he cannot, conscientiously, worship; other beings besides the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The present state of both the Church and the Dissenters, is fairly and candidly described, in the little volume before us; which for its succinct historical details, its just exposition of the real question at issue, and its uniformly charitable reflections, may be properly recommended to the young, in particular, for whose use it was compiled.

Art. VII. *A Brief View of the Chief Grounds of Dissent from the Church of England, by Law established: A Discourse first delivered in Exeter, May 13th, 1810, and repeated in Plymouth, April 5th,* 1812. *By Lant Carpenter, LL. D.* 12mo. pp. 20. 6d. J. Johnson and Co.

This discourse is what it purports to be, a view of the grounds of dissent from the Established Church; and the author advocates the cause of dissent with ability and moderation. Most of the reasons assigned are such as operate on the minds of all Dissenters; a few of them are peculiar to Unitarians.

Dr. Carpenter places, in front of his arguments for Dissent, "the very constitution of the Church of England," as implying "the right of the civil magistrate to interfere in affairs of religion." (p. 3.) This appears to us to be beginning at the right place. But under this head we find, (pp. 5 & 6,) an admission of the lawfulness, on Christian principles, of "the direct maintainance of public worship," by the magistrate, in which we are not prepared to concur. The right to establish religious worship, involves the right to establish a creed by which religious worship shall be regulated; and to endow a creed with immunities and benefits, is, unless uniformity of faith can be ensured, to make all the members of a community contribute to opinions which some will believe to be erroneous. And what would be the state of Quakers, and of Christians who should follow the opinion of the late Mr. Wakefield, not to mention conscientious unbelievers, under the magistrate's *direct maintainance of public worship?*

But whilst we cannot withhold our *dissent* from a single accidental admission, in the discourse, we are constrained to declare our cordial approbation of its arguments generally, and of the manner and spirit in which they are proposed.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

THE events of the last month are of great importance to the religious part of the community, and the result of them will not easily be anticipated by any of our politicians. The Catholic question, as it is called, has gone through a complete discussion in the House of Commons; for what could remain unsaid, after a four days debate, carried on by men of the greatest talents and eloquence in this country. It was evident, after the first day, that the cause of toleration had gained ground, for a spirit of enquiry and liberality had gone forth, which was not to be counteracted by the lower schemes of sordid self-interest. Previous to the debate, it was generally imagined, that toleration would have a greater number of advocates than heretofore, but still to be successful was deemed a chimerical idea: a respectable minority was all that could be expected, and this was to be sufficient to keep alive the hopes of the dissidents, that they might, by proper conduct, expect at a future time, some marks of indulgence and favour.

The temper of the House was soon, however, discovered, and it went in unison with the admirable speeches delivered with great animation, by Mr. Grattan and Mr. Plunkett. By these very able speakers the whole question was set in the clearest point of view, and the cheers of the Irish members demonstrated to the House, what were the feelings of those who were the most interested in the debate. For it must be observed, that the emancipation of the Catholics is of little or no consequence, as far as this island only is concerned. They form too small a part of its population to render them the objects of apprehension, either to the government or to the established clergy, and the latter, probably, would not have objected to any favour granted them, if it were not for the fears, that such concessions might bring on claims from other classes of Dissenters. But, in Ireland, the Catholics form a very great majority of the population of that country, and possess in it considerable political influence: and if the Irish members saw no danger in extending the right hand of fellowship to them, it surely did not become the English to keep up the ball of discord.

But a great point in this debate was the conduct of the ministry, which being divided on the subject, had not taken the usual care to instruct its friends on the line of conduct to be expected from them. It is now generally understood, that no treasury letters were issued, and that this was not to be considered as a cabinet question. Besides, a member of the cabinet and persons intimately connected with the administration, spoke in favour of the Catholics, and there was a general want of energy, on the part of their opponents, with an evident disclaiming of every feeling that looked like intolerance or persecution. The only speech, that savoured of the old school, was that of Sir William Scott: but his was looked upon merely as a technical speech, rather than the language of the heart; and the arguments adduced savoured more of the profession of which he is at the head, than a knowledge derived from a liberal intercourse with the world, or enlarged views of the Christian religion.

The great difficulty, and it must not be disguised that it is a great one, was the relation between the Catholics and their head, now a subject to our enemy, whose influence or interference under whatever name it goes, cannot but be an object of suspicion to the constituted authorities of every country. In fact it is so, where the Catholic is the predominant religion, and the sovereign prescribes the mode by which it is exercised, some with broader, others with narrower limits. The sentiment, however was prevalent, that religious opinions, merely as such, were not to interfere with civil rights, though we confess we found no small difficulty in reconciling the language of the House with the continuance of the Test and Corporation Acts. The House was very fully atttended, for on taking the votes, there were in favour of the Catholic petition, two hundred and sixty-four and against it two hundred and twenty-four, and a future day was set apart for taking its merits into consideration. On that day, after a short debate, it was agreed, that a Committee should be formed to draw up a Bill suited to the question; and it is understood that the heads of such a Bill will be laid before the house, previous to the holidays, that, during the recess, it may duly be considered, and the Bill itself, with its provisions, will then become the subject of discussion.

The Charter of the East India Company has also been brought before the House, and the ministry remain firm to their purpose of opening the whole eastern trade, except that to China, to the subjects of the United Kingdom, provided they use vessels not under three hundred and fifty tons burden, and the ports in which the commodities imported are landed have warehouses safe, for the purposes of the revenue. The regulations were contained in fifteen resolutions, the last of which appoints a bishop and three archdeacons to be paid for by the company. This appointment must excite a smile on the countenances of all, who have attended to the religious concerns of the east, where it is well known, that the efforts for introducing Christianity into the peninsula of India have been carried on and at a great expence by persons, who do not belong to the established church. Besides of the natives of this island settled in India, the greater portion, we believe, belong to the Presbyterian church of Scotland. Be this as it may, the appointments will doubtless be splendid, and all we can wish is, that they may not interfere with the more humble agents, who are endeavouring to extend the limits of the Redeemer's kingdom. The question will, doubtless, occupy the attention of the Society formed by the opposition to Lord Sidmouth's Bill, which has already taken into consideration the obstacles now existing to the preaching of Christianity in India, and if they do not take care to get a clause into the new bill in behalf of the missionaries, the new bishop and his archdeacons may prevent encroachments on his diocese, and subject them to such regulations as will not suit the purposes of their missions.

Attention to religion in any shape will always give us pleasure; and the appointment of a bishop indicates the resolution of government not to be inattentive to the spiritual welfare of its eastern subjects. At home the Bible Society continues to prove, that the higher classes feel the importance of religion in the world; for at several meetings of new Auxiliary Societies, persons of the highest rank have borne their testimony to the necessity of diffusing the truths of revelation. Among them we read with pleasure the manly declaration of Lord Barham, on the superiority of being an instrument in promoting Christian truth to that of any honour which could be conferred by mortal man. In this we concur entirely with his lordship; for what are the temporal gratifications of this life, when compared with the lowest seat in the Redeemer's kingdom.

Another very curious occurrence has taken place, of great importance in the religious history of this country, and deserving the attention of the sect established by law, as well as of all who are zealous for the honour of Christianity. A father had a son, who was guilty of atrocious cruelty towards his wife and of adultery, and for such a son he was assigned as guardian *ad litem*, but refused to undertake the office. In consequence of this refusal, he was excommunicated by the judge of the consistorial courts of the Bishop of London, and, in consequence, injured in his business, and thrown into prison by one of his creditors, from which he was relieved by the judge himself, either from compassion of his distress, or a sense of his injustice, or from (as stated by Lord Ellenborough) the infirmity of a great man, or from a combination of all these circumstances put together. Being out of prison, he brought an action against the judge of the Consistory for the injuries he had sustained through this erroneous or criminal conduct.

The judge was exculpated by all parties from malice in this case, and Sir John Nicholl, the judge to whom the appeal lay in the ecclesiastical courts, declared, that the father was liable to be appointed guardian *pendente lite*, and still remained of the same opinion. The excommunication followed as a thing of course. On this case, the jury, after remaining out a half an hour, gave a verdict for the excommunicated person, damages forty shillings, and the foreman read a paper to the following purport. The jury beg leave to assure the lord chief justice, that by this their verdict, they do not mean to attach the slightest impeachment on the most respectable character of Sir W. Scott,

Whether the character of a man is impeached by the verdict of a jury against him or not, may be of importance personally to Sir William Scott, and with his personal character we disclaim any interference; we have to do with him only as this case has brought him into notice, exactly in the same manner as when the cause of the Reverend Mr. Stone was tried before this very judge. The great question is the sentence of excommunication, unfortunately, as it is termed by Lord Ellenborough, the only method of enforcing the sentences of the ecclesiastical courts, and which he wished might be changed for some other. To be sure, any man who has the least regard for the Christian religion must wish it to be changed. Consider a moment: a man refuses to be guardian to a worthless son, and on this account, at a solemn meeting of his neighbours for divine service, he is held up to them as unworthy of Christian communion, and he remains in this state for ten months, when he is absolved, the two clergymen, who read the sentence of excommunication and absolution, deposing, that they had executed their offices duly on this occasion before large congregations. In what a situation does a Christian minister stand, and how is the Christian religion exposed to ridicule upon such a profanation of a religious assembly; that religion which teaches us love to our fellow creatures, is to be made an instrument in a civil process. Besides the exclusion from religious services, the excommunicated person cannot sue, cannot be a juror, cannot be a witness. Is this a light matter? Is such a power to be vested in any court, particularly in one, all whose modes of proceedings are so alien from those of the courts of common law?

We are not surprised that Sir William Scott should have wished to hush up this matter, and that his interest to get the injured man a place under government should have been promised. The eyes of the country are turned towards these courts, and Lord Folkstone rendered it a beneficial service by bringing their proceedings into parliament. The danger of blending civil with spiritual jurisdiction has been the great argument on the subject of the Pope's supremacy; but the inconvenience to be apprehended from the interference of his pretended holiness in this country will never amount to a hundredth part of the wretchedness occasioned by the strange jumbling together of civil law and religion in consistorial courts. The vindication of Sir W. Scott will apply to that of every act of the Inquisition, which proceeds by fixed laws, and their excommunication closes with the spectacle of a burning: but it would be deemed exceedingly rude and impolite and unjust to impute any thing improper in the head inquisitor upon this occasion: he merely did the business of the court, and it was unfortunate, as Lord Ellenborough said in the case of our ecclesiastical courts, that excommunication was their custom? so in Spain, fire and faggot should be the process of the holy Inquisition.

The horrid circumstances that took place some time back in the royal palace have been brought again before the public view by a trial for a libel, and a letter from Sir Everard Home, an eminent surgeon who inspected the body of Sellis, the wretched man found by a coroner's inquest to be *felo de se*. The libel threw out insinuations of a very extraordinary nature, which were declared by the jury to be libellous, and the letter of the surgeon went to the corroboration of the verdict found by the coroner's jury. We have these two opinions on a fact, which has excited much of doubt in the public mind, namely, whether the wretched man was the murderer of himself, or had been the victim of some other person. It is one thing to doubt the perpetration of the act by the man himself, and another to throw out a charge against any individual by name, and when a medical man states his knowledge on the fact, it must be something strong indeed that should induce any one to call in question the validity of his asseveration, and the result of an inquiry founded on the oaths of witnesses and a jury. It is indeed possible, that such a number of persons might be deceived, but very improbable: and if they have been in this instance mistaken in their opinions, we may rely upon it, that sooner or later their judgment will be confuted or confirmed: for it is a good and useful proverb that—Murder will out.

Depravity of a different kind has been brought to light, and it has been obtruded upon the public in such a manner as to excite general conversation on the highest characters. It is now too well known, that the Prince and Princess Regent have for some time lived in a state of separation, and that very disgraceful and treasonable charges have been made against the latter. The Princess has come boldly forward and challenged inquiry in the most public manner, and her letter to the Speaker of the House of Commons discovers a mind sensible of the injustice done to her, and desirous that the whole world may know with what little foundation her character has been assailed. In consequence, a debate took place in the House of Commons, from which it appeared, that some years ago very malignant charges were brought against her royal highness, which were examined by commissioners, appointed by the King, who completely absolved her from criminality. Several members of the Privy Council, appointed by the Prince Regent, re-examined the papers on which the charges were made, and in the House it was declared again by ministers, that the charges of criminality were unfounded. The depositions taken in the first instance have since been all laid before the public in the newspapers, containing matter too gross to be detailed in this work; and in consequence, Mr. Whitbread thought it right to bring the question again under the cognizance of the House of Commons, with a view to institute a prosecution against a principal witness for the part she had taken in the transaction. At first it seemed to be the wish of ministers, that the matter should rest where it was, and that no farther notice should be taken of it; but Mr. Whitbread persisted in his resolution to take the sense of the house upon this subject, and the matter went through a long debate, but ended in a rejection of the measure proposed. The fact was, that Mr. Whitbread found, that the prosecution of the principal witness was involved in many technical difficulties, and in every way in which the question was viewed, the great thing sought for, namely, justice to all parties, was not easily to be obtained. The principal witness, however, came forward with great boldness, and, in a petition to the house, begged to be put into any situation to be made the object of a prosecution; thus persisting in the evidence before the public. The Princess is cleared by the judgment of all who have had cognizance of the crimes laid to her charge, and as they had every opportunity to sift the matter to the bottom, and the Princess was not permitted to reply, she cannot but be considered, by every impartial observer, as freed from the heinousness of guilt laid to her charge. The time too that has elapsed since the charges were first made, renders the supposition of their foundation in the highest degree improbable; for had there been the least ground for them, it cannot be supposed, that, in her situation with her husband, they could have been suffered to sleep for so long a time, in which also the Princess was received by her royal father at court, and acknowledged by the whole family as guiltless. It is melancholy that such a developement should have been made public. High stations should not be made the theme of public contempt. Malignity will find too much in the detail to feast upon, and we must lament, for the sake of the high parties concerned, and for the daughter, on whom the eyes of the nation are placed, that such a breach has been made in their domestic quiet: but, if it cannot be repaired, surely it is the interest of us all, that it should be as little as possible injurious to the nation.

These discussions at home have almost driven out the thoughts of continental affairs, in which the ruin of Buonaparte's power and influence become every day more and more apparent. The Russians are pursuing their successful career, the French every where disappearing before them, and their state may be known by the necessity they have been under to quit Hamburgh, to which city the Russians are approaching. The latter have overrun Prussia, and the king of Saxony has left his capital of Dresden. In short the French talk no longer of the Vistula, but their armies, if they can muster them, will find enough to employ them on the defence of the Rhine. The language also of the great Emperor is changed. His Exposé talks of the arts of peace and agricultural improvements; at the same time we must not lose sight of the energies of his mind, which if he is seconded by his people, will still find resources for the defence, if not for the aggrandizement of his empire. The powers on the Baltic are again likely to form a close connection with this country; and the consequence is an increase in the demand for our manufactures, and an expectation of free trade with all the Northern parts in the summer. This is expected to be attended with a subsidy to Sweden, and Russia is to assist us with troops for the deliverance of Spain. This latter kingdom does not seem to have derived any benefit from the reverses of Buonaparte; but the trial remains to be made, and there is every appearance of a severe conflict, not only in that unhappy country but in other quarters of Europe.

The American war presents us with no great exploits on either side, but sufficient to teach both parties, that in a contest of this kind, they will, according to a vulgar saying, get nothing but blows. On land we have defeated the troops employed in an invasion of Canada, and taken the general prisoner; and by sea they have taken another of our frigates, in which by chance was a general of our army, going out as governor of one of the settlements in the East Indies. The effects on the two countries of these engagements shew the nature of the war, and the hopes and fears of the parties employed in it. The captains of the American frigates, who have been successful against us, are received with the highest honours on their arrival into their country, and policy points out evidently the propriety of encouraging every effort of their nascent maritime strength. To cope with Great Britain on the seas seems now a thing not impossible; yet they have not ships enough to set up a claim to the title of navy. Encouraged by their success they have however determined on building sixteen ships of the line, and with their resources and line of coast it is impossible to say in how short, or how long a time they will have prepared such a force. In England the capture of another frigate spread a very thick gloom over every countenance. It was not the loss of the ship; for what is it in the number with which we cover the seas; but this is a farther proof, that our frigates are not a match for those of America, and thence arises the question; How came it to pass, that our admiralty, knowing the size and weight of metal of the American frigates, did not prepare a proper sort of vessel to meet them, or at least send out such a force into the American seas, as should prevent their few frigates from cruising about at their pleasure. The number of captures also by the American privateers, which is very considerable, is another proof, that our new enemy is by no means to be despised; and that this war, trifling as it appeared in the commencement, may bring on consequences of the most serious nature to this country.

Indeed, who that considers what the Americans are, their origin, their activity, their industry, and we may say their youth as a government, can doubt, that every motive of interest and prudence concurred in deprecating a conflict with such a people. Their sailors have been in our ships, and have been inured to our mode of warfare: they are ambitious to distinguish themselves; and when we compare together the two ships, their's manned by Americans, and perhaps some Englishmen rendered desperate from the circumstances in which they are placed, the confidence in one arising from a consciousness of superior force in their weight of metal, we are not to be surprised at the results of the conflicts on the seas. But surely the knowledge of their strength should have been kept back as long as possible; and especially if the causes of complaint were such as might have been brought to an accommodation. The angry passions are now afloat, strong hopes are excited on the part of the inferior nation, whilst the superior sees nothing to be obtained by victory: glory there can be none, in beating a nation without a fleet and army; and profit there can be none, since the advantages of trade in the ordinary intercourse far overbalances any thing, that we can obtain by the depression of the enemy. In the Congress the war is now spoken of as perfectly justifiable on their side: they think they can use with propriety the European phrase, a just and necessary war: but we lament, that they have not learnt a better lesson from the unhappy conduct of mankind, since the time of Cain, and that they promise to follow the same wicked, and we might almost say the same ridiculous course as other nations. They will pursue, it is to be feared, the same career of ambition and folly, and waste their blood and treasure and strength in destroying their fellow creatures, which might be so usefully employed in bringing into cultivation the lands between them and the Pacific Ocean. We were in hopes that they would be a nation, acting in obedience to the first law of God to man, and from this rule no nation can depart without those sufferings, which deviation from right conduct must always produce. No prosperity, which they can arrive at by force, will equal what they might more easily have obtained by the too much despised methods of peaceful industry. So completely does the human race labour under delusion as every where to apply honour to force,—to feats of arms, without considering the cause, by which alone an application to them can be justified.

INTELLIGENCE.

Welsh Unitarian Society.

The Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Welsh Theo-Unitarian Society, was held on Thursday the 25th. of June, 1812, at Aberdar, near Merthyr Tydvil. Mr. J. James of Cardiganshire introduced the services of the day with prayer and reading a portion of the Scriptures. Mr. W. Morris of Swansea, preached from Matt. xi. 6. Mr. T. Davis of Coventry then delivered a discourse, in English, from Matt. xvi. 18. Mr. D. Davis of Neath followed, and delivered a sermon, which he had, at the request of several respected friends, proposed for the day, on the doctrine of the final restoration of all men to true religion, virtue and happiness, from Heb. xi. 6. He prefaced his discourse with an extemporaneous address, to a very crowded and perseveringly attentive audience, on the paramount duty of every Christian to oppose what he believes to be pernicious error, and openly to avow and zealously to propagate what he believes to be salutary truth. He concluded with explaining the nature of the society, and an exhortation to zealous exertion to promote its important objects. Mr. T. Davies of Coedycymmer ended the services of the day with prayer. Two sermons were delivered the preceding afternoon, by Mr. J. James, from Rom. viii. 1. and Mr. Wm. Thomas of Llangundeyrn, from Luke xxiii, 34.

Mr. D. Davis was requested by the society to publish his discourse.

A dinner was provided for the ministers and other friends from a distance, at a neighbouring public house, at the expence of a few warm friends of the cause at Aberdar. After dinner the business of the society, &c. was transacted in the meeting-house, where it was

Resolved, That the annual meeting of the society be henceforth held on the next Thursday after the 24th. of June.

That the next annual meeting be held at Gellionnen, near Neath, and that Mr. T. Davies of Coedycymmer be appointed to preach.

That Messrs. E. Williams, J. James, D. J. Rees, B. Phillips, D. Davis, J. Jones, and T. Davies be the committee; and Mr. J. Rowland treasurer and secretary.

On the motion of Mr. E. Williams it was

Resolved, That, to implant in this society an inherent principle of self-reformation, which every human institution ought to possess, its rules and institutes be revised every third year; and that the committee be requested to take them under their consideration, and communicate the result of their deliberations to the next annual meeting.

On the motion of D. Davis, seconded by Mr. Perkins, it was further

Unanimously Resolved, That to worship God agreeably to the dictates of one's own conscience, is the natural and unalienable right of every human being.

That it is the important duty of every man to exercise this right without infringing on the rights of others.

That no man ought to be deprived of any civil privilege, on account of his religious opinions, when he demeans himself as a good citizen.

That, as some of the penal laws of this country are in opposition to these principles, we highly approve of the conduct of the ministers of the three denominations, assembled at Dr. Daniel Williams's Library, in Red Cross Street, on Tuesday the 21st. of April, 1812, in asserting the rights of conscience, and in petitioning parliament for a repeal of all penal statutes now in force, whose operation extends to the province of religion.

That a petition, founded on these resolutions be drawn up, and presented to both houses of parliament, and that the Rev. D. Davis, Mr. Edward Williams, and the Rev. Thomas Rees, be appointed a committee to draw up the petition.

Upwards of twenty new members were added to the list.

The Report of the Manchester New College, removed to York, at the Twenty-sixth Annual Meeting.

August 28, 1812.

The trustees of Manchester College, continue to experience great satisfaction in being able again to present to its numerous friends a favourable report.

By a reference to the cash account, it will be seen that under some heads there has been an increase, and under others a diminution, in the receipts, on a comparison with those of former years. The individual subscriptions, which have been annually increasing in amount, since the removal of the College to York, have this year received an addition of 72*l.* 5*s.* a considerable part of which, arises from the great activity and zeal of the numerous friends of the Institution in Bristol, to some of whom the trustees are likewise indebted for an additional exhibition of 5l. per ann. granted for the use of one of the Divinity Students. The rental of the property in Manchester is reduced, owing to one of the houses having been unoccupied for half the year: it is, however, again let, though with a small diminution in the rent. The congregational collections, which have always ben liable to considerable fluctuations, have fallen off considerably, and amount to little more than one half of what they were in 1811. In the benefactions there is a very important increase, several gentlemen having presented large donations, with a view to a more speedy liquidation of the debt on the York buildings, than could otherwise have been accomplished. By means of their liberality, the trustees have been enabled this year to appropriate 800*l.* to that object, and to make a small addition to the permanent fund.

The students have all been lodged, during the past session, in the recently purchased buildings. This arrangement has contributed materially to their comfortable accommodation, and to the more easy, orderly, and punctual discharge of the business of the college; and also, no doubt, (though in these respects the trustees have never, in former years, had any complaint to make,) to the great regularity and propriety of conduct which has distinguished the session. This circumstance cannot fail to afford particular satisfaction to those who have, in so handsome a manner, enabled the trustees to effect the purchase, and it is hoped will stimulate others to contribute their aid towards the discharge of the debt which yet remains on the buildings. The accomplishment of this object is the more desirable, as the appropriation of 150*l.* per ann. to its gradual liquidation, must considerably diminish, for a time, the funds applicable to the education of the students for the ministry; a circumstance which, in the present great want of ministers in different parts of the country, is particularly to be regretted. It is, therefore, confidently hoped that the supporters of the college will continue their exertions, as well for the maintenance of its permanent interests, by individual subscriptions and congregational collections, as by submitting to the consideration of their friends among the advocates for rational religion and freedom of thought and inquiry, the address which was circulated by the committee on the 14th. of August, 1812, on the subject of the new buildings.

The business of this institution is distributed among three tutors. The Rev. John Kenrick, M. A. gives lectures on the Greek and Roman Classics, on the principles of grammar, and on ancient and modern history, and superintends the exercises of the students of the first three years in Latin and English composition. The Rev. William Turner, jun. M. A. undertakes the departments of mathematics and of natural and experimental philosophy, and also gives lectures on logic, metaphysics, and ethics. The Rev Charles Wellbeloved, theological tutor, and director of the institution, gives lectures on the evidences of natural and revealed religion; on the principles of biblical criticism, and on ecclesiastical history; instructs the Divinity Students, and such Lay Students as many desire it, in the languages of the Original Scriptures, and of the most important versions; critically reads over with them the whole of the Old and New Testaments; and from those pure sources, encourages them, each for himself, to form his own views of the important doctrines of revelation. He also pays particular attention, during the last two years of their course, to the formation of a proper style of composition for the pulpit.

The annual examinations, which are always held on the last *Wednesday* and *Thursday* in *June*, continue to be attended by many friends of the institution, with increasing pleasure and satisfaction. On the late occasion, June 24 and 25, 1812, the first prize was adjudged to Mr. Samuel Robinson, of Woodlands, near Manchester, the second to Mr. Benjamin Mardon, Jun. of Exeter; and prizes, each equal in value to the third, to Mr. Lewis Lewis, of South Wales, Mr T. C. Holland of Manchester, and Mr. Samuel Smith, the son of William Smith, Esq. M. P. for Norwich. The number of students, for the ensuing session, is twenty-five; fifteen intended for the ministry, and ten lay students. Of the former, Messrs. Manley, Hutton, Henry Turner, and George Kenrick, will be in the last year of their course; Messrs. Lewis, Brettell, Ashton, Holland, and Hincks, in the fourth; Messrs. Wallace, and Bakewell, in the third, Mr. Mardon, in the second, and Messrs. Cannon of Sheffield, Peene of Hackney, and Jevons of Liverpool, in the first. Of these Messrs. Hutton, Peene, and Jevons, entirely, and Messrs. Manley and Hincks, in part, are on their own foundation.

In order to secure, as far as is possible, the respectability of the Students who shall be educated for the ministry in this seminary, with regard both to character and literary attainments, the trustees have resolved, "That, in future, no candidate shall be admitted "on its foundation, but on the recommendation of three Protestant Dissenting Ministers, residing in the neighbourhood where he lives, who shall "certify, that at the commencement of "his course, he will have attained the "full age of sixteen; that on their personal examination, his moral character, natural endowments, and classical "proficiency, are such as to qualify him "for becoming a student for the ministry; and that the profession is the "object of his own voluntary choice. "His ability to read Homer and Horace, "will be considered as essential to his "admission."—All applications must be addressed to "The Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, York," who will lay them before the annual meeting of trustees, at York, on the last Wednesday in June; at which meeting they will be taken into consideration, and those candidates preferred, who appear, from the testimonials produced, to be most eligible.

Letters on the subject of this institution, may also be addressed to George William Wood, Esq. treasurer, Manchester, or to the Rev. William Turner, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, by whom, or by any of the deputy treasurers, subscriptions and donations are received.

SAMUEL SHORE, jun. President.

Missions in India.

The Resolutions introduced by Lord Castlereagh into the House of Commons on Monday the 22d. instant providing for the establishment of a Bishopric and three Archdeaconries in India without intimating that Christian missionaries of other denominations should be relieved from the powers of exclusion and banishment possessed by the East India Company fill us with just alarm. We therefore apprehend that it may become necessary for all friends to religious freedom, and to the unrestricted promulgation of christianity among the ignorant and idolatrous inhabitants of Asia, to unite in convening local meetings, and in presenting petitions to parliament for relief. In the mean time we refer with pleasure to the appropriate and impressive Resolutions of the Committee of "The Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty," inserted on the cover of the Magazine, and invite the attention of every benevolent and pious reader to a subject now very important, and on which the moral improvement of fifty millions of Hindoos and of their posterity may essentially depend.

Charter of the East India Company.

The friends to Religious Freedom will probably participate in the pain with which we have perused the eleventh Resolution submitted by Lord Castlereagh to the House of Commons, on Monday, March the 22d. respecting the formation of an episcopal establishment in India. Convinced that Christianity does not require secular support, and that establishments have invariably resembled destructive plants entwining an oak, we apprehend that the growth of knowledge and virtue will be thereby retarded, and therefore receive the proposition with sincere regret.

That regret is encreased by a declaration which accompanied this Resolution, that Government intend to perpetuate the powers possessed and exercised by the East India Company, of excluding Christian missionaries from those regions where superstition, vice, and female degradation reign with triumphant sway. To this determination which every liberal and pious mind must disapprove, we apprehend, that not only the supporters of the various existing Missionary Societies, but that all those who are attached to rational dissent, and to just principles of Liberty, will unite in a general opposition, with which neither the East India Company, nor the administration may be willing to contend. The Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty, appear to have early anticipated the necessity for such exertions, and have on March the 2d. adopted some judicious resolutions, which are printed on our wrapper, and which we cheerfully commend.

NO POPERY.

Harlow Resolutions and Petition.

At a respectable meeting of the friends of civil and religious liberty, resident at Harlow in the county of Essex, and the villages adjacent, held agreeably to public notice, Feb. 17, 1813, at the Green Man, Harlow, to "consider the propriety of petitioning the Legislature for a repeal of ALL penal laws in matters of religion:"—

Mr. JOHN BARNARD in the Chair:

The following Resolutions, proposed by Mr. B. FLOWER and seconded by MONTAGU BURGOYNE, Esq. passed unanimously.

Resolved,

I. That to worship God agreeably to the dictates of conscience, unrestrained by human authority, is the *natural* and *unalienable* RIGHT of every rational creature, confirmed by the New Testament—the grand Charter of Christianity.

II. That we regard with extreme regret the existence on our Statute Book, of penal laws respecting religion, some of which, owing to the increased liberality of the times, are too obnoxious to be executed, and *all* manifestly inconsistent with the *rights of men*, of *Britons* and of *Christians*.

III. That as all the *right* we claim, on the behalf of ourselves and others, is ELIGIBILITY to office, we do most earnestly entreat the legislature to repeal ALL *penal statutes in matters of religion;* that the sovereign may possess the constitutional exercise of his prerogative, our fellow citizens the due exercise of their elective rights in the choice of officers to places of public trust: and that ALL classes of his majesty's subjects may be freed from any stigma on account of their faith and mode of worship, and may equally participate the benefits of the constitution.

IV. That Petitions be presented to both houses of Parliament, conformable to the above resolutions.

[Petitions drawn up conformably to the above resolutions were then read and agreed to—*unanimously.*

V. That the Right Honourable Lord Holland be requested to present the petition to the House of Lords.

VI. That Samuel Whitbread, Esq. be requested to present the Petition to the House of Commons.

VII. That these resolutions be inserted in the Morning Chronicle, the Statesman, the County Chronicle and the Chelmsford Chronicle.

JOHN BARNARD, Chairman.

Resolved unanimously, That the thanks of this meeting be given to Mr. B. FLOWER, for the trouble he has taken in preparing the above resolutions, and for the able, luminous, and energetic manner in which he has recommended them to the adoption of this meeting.

Mr. Barnard having left the Chair,

Resolved unanimously, That the thanks of the meeting be given to the Chairman for his proper and impartial conduct.

PETITION.

To the Honourable the Knights, Citizens and Burgesses, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, the Petition of the undersigned inhabitants of Harlow and the adjacent villages in the county of Essex,

Sheweth,

That your petitioners are firmly convinced that to worship God agreeably to the dictates of conscience, unrestricted by human authority, is the natural and inalienable right of every rational creature, confirmed by the New Testament, the grand Charter of Christianity.

That your petititioners regard with extreme regret the existence on our statute books of penal laws respecting religion, some of which owing to the increased liberality of times, are too obnoxious to be executed, and *all* manifestly inconsistent with the rights of men, of Britons and of Christians.

That, as all the rights we claim on the behalf of ourselves and others, is eligibility to office, we do most earnestly petition your Honourable House for the repeal of all penal statutes in matters of religion, that the sovereign may possess the constitutional exercise of his prerogative, our fellow citizens, the due exercise of their elective rights, in the choice of officers to places of public trust, and that all classes of his majesty's subjects may be freed from any stigma on account of their faith and mode of worship, and may equally participate the benefits of the constitution.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

Proceedings at Exeter.

(In a Letter to the Editor.)

Exeter, March 20*th*, 1813.

SIR,

The Dissenters have had a considerable share in the proceedings in this place, respecting the Roman Catholic Question; and as some account of them may not be unacceptable to your readers, I request your insertion of the following narrative, in your next number.

Late on Wednesday night (Feb. 17th) some of the friends of Catholic emancipation were informed, that a meeting of the inhabitants had just been summoned, "to petition parliament against the Roman Catholic claims." The handbill was published in the afternoon of Wednesday, and the meeting was to be held at noon the next day. If more time had been allowed, the friends of religious liberty, (I mean the friends of *universal, unshackled,* religious liberty,) would have endeavoured, by means of the press, to enlighten the minds of their fellow-citizens on the subject; but the handbills were very sparingly, (if not partially) distributed; and the meeting was known but to very few of them, till two or three hours before it took place. From the tenor of the advertisement, we were led to expect that no discussion would be allowed; however, the meeting was declared to be deliberative: and opportunity was given to the friends of religious liberty to declare their sentiments. Their efforts were ineffectual as far as regarded the immediate object of the meeting, but they have the satisfaction of having done their duty; and they have reason to think, that in several instances their statement made an impression on the candid opponents of the Roman Catholic claims. Our first proposal was, to adjourn the meeting till the following Saturday. This was negatived by a large majority, and we then moved an unexceptionable petition, which (for want of time to draw up one) we copied from the proceedings of the Wiltshire meeting. This was of course negatived; but we gave notice that it would be presented to the House of Commons, as a counter petition from the Protestant inhabitants of Exeter.

We never expected that our petition would receive the signatures of any large proportion of the inhabitants. We had power, intolerance, and misrepresentation against us. I do not mean to say, that none of the opponents of the Roman Catholic claims are so from principle,—because, after cool investigation, they think they perceive dangers of no small magnitude, arising from their being acceded to, as inevitable consequences: but I do say, that the late proceedings of this city and county, display a spirit of intolerance and bigotry, which I should have hoped would not arise in this enlightened age to disgrace the religion of Protestants; I do say, that it has led in various instances to the most unjustifiable and injurious misrepresentations, respecting both the Roman Catholics, and those who have stood forwards in their behalf. As to ourselves, our cause is so noble a one, appealing so powerfully to our feelings as Britons, and our principles as Christians, that we regard them not; and though we have been publicly charged with pursuing "a crooked and mistaken policy," though we have been held up to the odium of our fellow inhabitants by placards full of the vilest insinuations, and our names posted up as "conspirators," I do not hesitate in the belief, that we should cheerfully go over again the same track, if similar occasion for our exertions should arise.

But to return. The advocates of intolerance found it easy to appeal to the prejudices, passions, and fears of the ignorant. They were informed, that the Roman Catholics are aiming at the throne,—sometimes that the oaths which they at present take, are among the restrictions which they wish to have removed,—at others, that they will not keep them,—that when in power they will overturn the church, and "that there would be a Papist king who would cut their throats." This last *argument* was actually employed by a person who lately held the office of chief magistrate in this city, to induce a parcel of mere *boys* to sign the Anti-Catholic petition. He was seen in the act of directing a lad of about 9 or 10 years of age, in the manner of signing the petition; and when remonstrated with on the subject, he replied that they were all interested in the business. It is but justice to the present mayor to state, that when informed of this vitiating transaction, he gave orders to prevent a repetition of it.

The opposition to the Anti-Catholic measures at the Guild-hall, was confined to the Unitarians, (in which appellation I include all the advocates for the proper unity of God, and its necessary consequences:) and this might a little contribute to the subsequent measures taken by some of their dissenting brethren, in order to remove the *disgraceful* imputation of being favourable to the Catholic claims. On Saturday afternoon a requisition was delivered to the *mayor*, signed by twenty *Dissenters*, requesting him to call a meeting of the Dissenters of this city, to petition against the Roman Catholics. If he had acceded to the request, it might have been in the power of their friends, to have convinced their mistaken brethren, that it did not become them to endeavour to prevent the conciliatory purposes of legislature, towards those who are labouring under much heavier difficulties than themselves, on account of their fidelity to what they think religious truth, and to have shewn them by various unquestionable documents, that they need not feel those alarms, which have been stirred up for purposes and by means which Christianity utterly disclaims. The mayor however was of opinion, that in his official capacity he could not take any share in a meeting of Dissenters; but he thought proper to meet the requisitionists at the Guildhall, to tell them that he could not comply with their request. This appears to have given rise to Lord Rolle's statement in the House of Lords, that the Petition of the Dissenters of Exeter, against the Catholic claims, had been agreed to at a public meeting. There was no public meeting of the Dissenters; though for the reason already assigned, I wish there had.—The mayor intimated to the requisitionists, that if they wished to show that the Dissenters of Exeter were not generally favourable to the Roman Catholic claims, they might petition against them. The idea was approved and in the warmth of their zeal, they were going to adopt the general Petition of the inhabitants, (which probably all, or most of them had previously signed,) containing the following assertions,—that the church and state "are so closely interwoven, that they must stand or fall together,"—and that "the most extensive toleration of religious profession* and worship is already enjoyed by persons of every persuasion."—and directly implying that the Church of England is "the purest branch of the Protestant religion." The mayor, however, suggested the inexpediency of this step; and they drew up another petition, in which they represent the Roman Catholics as enjoying "liberty and the free exercise of their religion, as far as is consistent with the safety of the realm, as well as perfect security of their persons and property, in common with every other of his majesty's subjects."

A hand-bill was immediately printed and posted up in some parts of the city, (but I imagine not sent to any Dissenters supposed to be favourable to the Roman Catholic claims,) stating that "*a Petition from the Protestant Dissenters of the city of Exeter,*" against the Roman Catholic claims, would lie for signature, at the Guildhall, till the following Monday evening. We saw this hand-bill late on Saturday evening, and it appeared necessary to enter a protest against the insinuation it contained. On Sunday morning a few friends of unrestrained religious Liberty *to all,* (assured of the cooperation of many whom they had not time to consult,) resolved to set forwards the following Petition for the abolition of all penal statutes respecting religious opinions.—

The humble Petition of the undersigned Protestant Dissenters, attending divine worship in the city of Exeter.

Sheweth,

That your petitioners having observed, with great concern, that an attempt is being made, to convey to the legislature of the country an idea, that the Protestant Dissenters of this city are hostile to any relaxation of the disqualifying laws, by which his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects are excluded from Parliament and office,—your petitioners humbly beg leave to lay their sentiments before your Right Honourable House.

Your petitioners regard absolute liberty of conscience respecting religion, as the unalienable right of all men; and they cannot but consider all laws which tend to injure the interests and reputation of any persons, by subjecting them to disgrace, disability and privation of rights, on account of their religious opinions, as inconsistent with that unalienable right.

Your petitioners, therefore, though warmly attached to the principles of Protestantism and to the present constitution, do, with a special reference to the important subject now about to call the attention of Parliament, humbly petition your Right Honourable House, that all such laws may be repealed;—they, confiding in the wisdom of the legislature, to devise all necessary means to prevent any real danger to the Protestant religion, and to the present constitution and government of these realms.

[To be concluded in our next.]

---

* This is asserted by the petitioners while severe penalties still remain in the statute book against those who publicly oppose the doctrine of the Trinity; while the Roman Catholic soldier depends for the free exercise of his religion on the will of the Commander in Chief, while the Catholics are not permitted by law to make any permanent provision for their clergy or places of worship, and while in Ireland there is no law to protect their clergy from interruption when engaged in their public duties.

ERRATUM.

P. 129, 2nd col. l. 20, for "Ponks" read *Toncks.*

THE

MONTHLY REPOSITORY

OF

Theology and General Literature.

No. LXXXVIII. APRIL. [Vol. VIII.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

Sketch of the Life, Writings and Character of Moses Mendelssohn.

> HAUD FACILE *emergunt, quorum virtutibus obstat*
> *Res angusta domi.*——Juven.

IN the catalogue of illustrious authors in Germany, during the eighteenth century, we find the name of a man who, under every disadvantage of birth and early situation, rose to intellectual, literary and moral eminence.

MOSES MENDELSSOHN* was born, in 1729, at Dessau, in the circle of Upper Saxony. His father, a Jewish school-master, had great difficulty in providing for the wants of the passing day; his office being little esteemed by the community of which he was a member, and very scantily remunerated. At home, the subject of this memoir was instructed only in Hebrew, and in the elements of the Mosaic religion: and although he was placed at one of the public schools of the Jews, he learnt scarcely any thing there which invigorated his faculties, or added to his stock of knowledge.

The works of Maimonides, however, fell into his hands while he was yet a boy. To the perusal of them he applied himself with a diligence which undermined his health. So fond was he of the employment, that he devoted to it whole nights: nor could he be easily torn from his favourite author, to whom he was mainly indebted for the love of truth, of free inquiry and of philosophical reflection, which characterized him through life,—and by his intimate acquaintance with whose writings his talents were developed and improved.

Those talents were at once considerable and varied. With more than usual strength of understanding Mendelssohn united a warm yet enlightened sensibility. His love of metaphysical investigation was mingled with occasional indulgence in polite literature. He wrote verses when he was only ten years old: but, though his translation of the Psalms, at a much later period, shews that he had some claim to the honours of a poet, his habits and his inclination marked him for a philosopher. He persevered in the study of Maimonides, and manifested a decided predilection for abstract speculations.

---

* The name signifies, *the son of Mendel.*

At the age of fourteen, he left his father's house. This step was taken with the consent of his parents, who could ill afford to keep him at home, and who shared his hope that he would be able to gratify in another scene his literary taste, and to surmount the obstacles of his poverty, his descent and his sickly frame. On his arrival at Berlin, he was without money, and apparently without a friend.

In this state of extreme indigence, he happened to gain the notice of a benevolent Jew, who gave him board and lodging, and did all that he could for his relief. Mendelssohn, too, had now the long wished for opportunity of making some progress in learning. Hearing that Frankel, who had formerly been a Rabbin, at Dessau, was stationed in Berlin, he conquered his natural bashfulness, and introduced himself to this person, who assisted him in studying the Talmud and Jewish theology, and engaged him to copy his manuscripts. This kind of labour, it must be confessed, did not suit exactly the young man's views: yet, being pursued with assiduity, it served to strengthen his powers and to prepare him for higher efforts.

Berlin was, at that period, the residence of many learned men, and even of some literary Jews, with whom Mendelssohn would gladly have associated, had not his indigence detained him in retirement. However, with one of these, who, like himself, was in very humble circumstances, he formed a valuable acquaintance. Israel Moses, a native of Stari Zamoze in Poland, had settled in Berlin, as the teacher of a school: but owing to the undaunted freedom with which he had exposed some pretensions of the Jewish ecclesiastics, he became the victim of persecution, and was reduced to poverty. The friendship which Mendelssohn contracted with him, was founded in the similarity of their intellectual habits as well as in that of their situation. He was a man of uncommon talents and various acquirements. To a large portion of general knowledge he added particular skill and proficiency in mathematics. Under such an instructor the pupil made rapid and sure advances. Israel Moses translated Euclid into Hebrew, for the benefit of Mendelssohn: and the reasonings of Maimonides, of whom both were enamoured, furnished them with an almost inexhaustible subject of discussion.

Other aids were still wanting. Hebrew was the only language of which Israel Moses was master: and Mendelssohn was ardently desirous of learning Latin. It was happy that the young Jewish physician, who had principally inspired the wish, lent his aid in giving it effect. This assistance was continued for half a year. But great as were Mendelssohn's obligations to his friendly guide, he owed still more to his own application and perseverance. It was with no little difficulty that he could spare money for the purchase of a grammar and a second-hand dictionary. By means of these he qualified himself for reading and understanding the works of Locke in a Latin translation. The acquisition was more than a compensation for the toil.

His attention was next engaged by the modern languages, particularly the French and English*, in the study of which, he availed himself of his intimacy with Doctor Gumperz, a young Jew, much distinguished by his literary habits, talents and attainments.

The circle of Mendelssohn's friends, was now larger: and his intercourse with persons of taste and learning, had an auspicious influence on his mind and manners. From no connexion, however, did he derive so much advantage as from that which began in 1754, with Lessing, in whom some of the richest treasures of intellect and knowledge were united with a superior disposition and ability to bring forward the mental powers of other men, and who was in the practice of examining with perfect freedom, subjects of the first consequence to human beings. Frederick Nicolai, a literary bookseller at Berlin, was the beloved associate of both. During more than twenty years these three friends were closely linked together by mutual affection and confidence: nor did their occasional discordancies in opinion produce the slightest jealousy or ill-will.

Nicolai was editor of a periodical work of high and deserved reputation: and in this he received occasional help from the pen of Mendelssohn, who, in 1755, came before the public with a volume of 'Letters, on a Taste for Beauty in the Arts,' &c. These were composed in the German language, which, at that time, was relatively in an uncultivated state. But Mendelssohn considerably improved it: his style was easy, perspicuous and elegant; and the world soon saw that an obscure and indigent Jew was destined to rank among the finest writers of his age and country.

His intense pursuit of his studies, in which, with an imprudence too common among literary men, he frequently passed the night, increased the weakness of his constitution. Once he was prevented for a whole year from attending to any employments which required abstraction of thought. From this threatening indisposition he recovered; and the writings which he afterwards published, are sufficient proofs that his intellectual vigour was unimpaired.

Mendelssohn's most important publication is 'Phædon, a Dialogue on the Immortality of the Soul.' But while it bears this title, in common with Plato's on the same subject, its reasonings are not those of heathen philosophy. It is divided into three parts: and prefixed to it is a life of Socrates, chiefly taken from the English of John Gilbert Cowper.

He was also the author of some performances, the object of which is the development of what may be termed *the philosophy of taste.* Of these the principal has been already mentioned. Among his metaphysical writings, his 'Essay on the Immateriality of the Soul,' his 'Dissertation on Evidence,' which gained the prize of the Berlin Academy, and his '*Morgenstunden*, [Morning-hours] or Lectures on the Being of a God,' the substance of which he had kindly delivered to some young relations and friends, who, towards the conclusion of his life, spent their mornings with him, must, of course, be ranked.

---

* To a work of Manasseh Ben Israel, "concerning the Jews, &c." translated from the *English,* Mendelssohn afterwards published a very admirable preface.

In his treatise entitled *Jerusalem*, he very ably discusses the subjects of religious liberty and the Mosaic dispensation. His purpose in writing it, was to place toleration on its proper basis, and to remove the popular prejudices against his Jewish brethren.

At the request of Hirschel Levi, chief rabbin at Berlin, he drew up his 'Ritual of the Jews.' In this undertaking also he had the benefit of the members of his own communion principally in view. The work is a compendium of those of their laws which relate to property, and the knowledge of which is essential in suits between individuals of this people. Such knowledge had hitherto been withholden from many of them, in consequence of the regulations in question being veiled in rabbinical Hebrew: but Mendelssohn now presented it to the German Jews, in the language of the country, and in a clear and attractive style.

He wrote, moreover, a Commentary, in Hebrew, on the Book of Ecclesiastes, and published separately, etymological notes on this part of the Bible, for the use of students.

With the benevolent intention of aiding the Jewish youth of Germany, in the study of the vernacular language, he printed his version of the five books of Moses, a specimen of which he had before given to the world.

Of his translation of the Psalms some account will, doubtless, be acceptable to the readers of the Monthly Repository.

It is dedicated to Ramler, a celebrated Lyric Poet of Germany, and an intimate associate of Mendelssohn's. In an interesting preface the translator makes his readers acquainted with the steps by which he advanced in executing a version of *all* the Psalms, and with the motives which prompted him to the undertaking. He has divided his translation into five books, and intimates his design of reserving some critical observations for a future volume, which however has not appeared. The version is eminently simple, pure and elegant, and often presents readings which are singularly happy. In this country it does not seem to be so much known as it deserves; although it strongly claims the notice of those students who have the means of availing themselves of the choicest treasures of German literature and theology.

The controversies in which Mendelssohn was a party, were highly injurious to his health and spirits.

Lavater, famous throughout Europe for his labours, if we must not call them his reveries, in Physiognomy, had translated from the French a work of Bonnet's, in proof of the truth of Christianity,—and, with the best intentions, dedicated his volume to Mendelssohn. The language of the dedication gave it the air of a challenge rather than the appearance of an act of courtesy. Mendelssohn was called upon by the zealous translator either to refute the arguments of Bonnet, or to embrace and avow the Christian faith. With the indelicacy of this proceeding he was justly hurt, and he published, in consequence, a letter to Lavater, in which he states his reasons for declining the discussion. He is perhaps to be commended for not obeying *such* a summons into the field of theological dispute. Yet, for the sake of the public, and for the benefit of truth, it were to be wished, that a man of Mendelssohn's powers had laid before the world the progress and the issue of his reflections on the claims of the Christian doctrine. From the tenor and language of his letter, he seems to have imagined, that by receiving the gospel he would renounce his belief of the divine origin of Judaism. But this opinion is a palpable error; although it be not uncommon among his Jewish brethren.

His death was hastened by his zeal in vindicating the memory of Lessing.

Spinoza, himself a Jew, was the author of some philosophical speculations, the tendency of which is generally considered to be destructive of the first principles of natural religion: and Jacobi, a German writer of notoriety, informed Mendelssohn, in a private letter, that those principles had been fully adopted by his deceased companion. Lessing, he said, had declared as much to him, not long before his dissolution. Nor can it well be doubted that *Jacobi* put this sense on certain expressions of the dying philosopher. Mendelssohn on the other hand, was persuaded that his correspondent must have misapprehended Lessing's sentiments. In vain, however, did he attempt to undeceive Jacobi: in vain did he appeal to the unreserved confidence which subsisted between Lessing and himself, to his perfect knowledge of his friend's opinions, and to the testimony of their common associates. No explanation could satisfy the party bringing the accusation, who even ventured on publishing this correspondence. A voluminous controversy followed, in which many others took a share. Mendelssohn was thought to have refuted his antagonist and to have avenged Lessing: but his life was in fact sacrificed to his exertions.

On the merits of the dispute it may not be very material to pass a judgment. Lessing, unquestionably, was in the practice of allowing the freest scope to his inquiries: and Jacobi unfortunately supposed that philosophical investigations are of necessity hostile to religion. Nevertheless, it is difficult to believe, that Mendelssohn was ignorant of the sentiments of his most intimate friend on a point of so much importance: and we cannot but admire the warmth of attachment by which he was animated to the defence of Lessing, and the vigorous talents of which he gave proof in the controversy, notwithstanding the increased weakness of his bodily constitution.

He died of an apoplexy, the effect of that weakness, January 4th. 1786, and was interred with every mark of honour which his brethren could shew.

Mendelssohn is described as having been particularly amiable in his family, to whom he bequeathed property sufficient for preserving them from want. He had carried on, for many years, a retail trade, and had superintended a silk-manufactory: yet he proved himself capable of combining the habits of a scholar with those of a man of business. His friends were accustomed to speak of him as eminently possessing the most valuable qualities of the understanding and the heart. Such were the wisdom and energy of his conversation that it was not uncommon to style him *the Socrates of Germany:* and, without doubt, he is a memorable example of the force of talent and perseverance in removing some of the greatest obstacles to the improvement of of the mind.

His friendships were not confined to his literary associates, nor his good offices, to the community of the Jews. There were some among the clergy who sought his advice, who admired his abilities and character, and who behaved to him with a confidence, affection and hospitality, no less gratifying to his own feelings than honourable to their's.

The life of Mendelssohn exhibits a pattern which young persons of a taste and ardour like his, and in similar circumstances, will do well to copy. They may hence learn never to distrust the governing Providence of God, never to remit the efforts of which they are capable, never to despise the dictates of an honourable prudence. It is principally with the view of inculcating such lessons as these that the present memoir of this extraordinary man has been prepared. Another end may perhaps be answered by the perusal of it—the reader may now have a stronger conviction that moral and intellectual excellence are not confined to particular denominations or sects of men.—In the age and nation in which he lived Mendelssohn was not the only literary Jew. Let the benefits of unrestricted toleration and liberal intercourse be extended to people of *all* persuasions in religion, and the minds and the character of *all* will be improved in the highest degree which humanity permits. We have in this country opulent Jews, some of whom are occasionally spoken of as patronizing, and some few as cultivating knowledge and the arts. But it is rarely, indeed, that any of these or of their humbler brethren in England have appeared with reputation as writers on subjects of general learning and science. There is not one of them who makes approaches to MENDELSSOHN. In these circumstances, it is natural to inquire, What cause can be assigned of this difference between the Jewish inhabitants of Great Britain and those of Germany? The practical solution of the problem, can be given by the legislature of the United Kingdom.

N.

[The preceding *Sketch, &c.* has been drawn up in part from *the Monthly Magazine,* (Vol. vi. 38—41.) but chiefly from a small work published at Hamburgh in 1797, and entitled *Leben und Meinungen Moses Mendelssohn, nebst dem geiste seiner Schriften in einem kurzen Abrisse dargestellet.* This latter piece of Biography, is an agreeable, intelligent performance, written apparently by a partial and intimate friend of Mendelssohn's: its most glaring defect is the neglect of method and arrangement.]

Historical Account of the Warrington Academy.

(Continued from p. 172.)

On Dr. Aikin's acceptance of the appointment unanimously proposed to him, of successor to Dr. Taylor, in the theological chair, Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Joseph Priestley (then minister at Namptwich, in Cheshire) was with equal unanimity invited to become the tutor in languages and polite literature. Of this distinguished person (*paterno et proprio amico)* so many accounts have been published, and so explicit, candid and instructive a narrative has been given by himself of all the particulars of his life, in the excellent Memoirs of himself to the period of his leaving England, and by his son, in continuation, to the time of his death, (which, having been reprinted in so cheap a form by the several Unitarian Societies, are probably in the hands of most of your readers) that I shall confine myself in this historical essay, to the period of his connection with the Warrington Academy.

It appears, from the work above referred to, that although almost every branch of literature had, at one time or another, engaged his attention, he would have preferred the mathematical and philosophical chair, if it had happened to be vacant. But though he distinctly states* that he had no particular fondness for the studies connected with the chair to which he was invited, yet he applied to them with great assiduity, when he had once accepted the charge. But it may well be presumed, from the account which he gives of his early education, (p. 4, 5.) from his constant close attention to classical studies, in conjuction with his friend Alexander (p. 18), both at Daventry, and afterwards, and from his subsequent engagements as a teacher of youth, that he brought with him to Warrington, a very extensive acquaintance with languages, both antient and modern,*both of which he taught at Warrington; and his Lectures on the

---

* Page 42. The gross perversion of this passage by Messrs. Bogue and Bennett has been well exposed by your able Reviewer, in p. 637, of your last volume. A worse perversion which they and several others, have dared to make of his death bed conversation with his family is also judiciously animadverted upon: but the author has been often mortified to see how his enemies and the enemies of truth have triumphed, and how Scrutator and others have laboured after explanations, and made admissions, to which they would never have been driven, if an over-nicety had not prevented the proper application from being given. It is known to too many persons, to expect that any silence can bury it in oblivion, and if this were possible, it would not be desirable, at the expence of the permanent settlement of even the shadow of a cloud upon the bright scene of his departure to a better world, that the misconduct of a near relation was the cause of greater distress and sorrow to Dr. Priestley, than any, or than all, the other events of his life: and it was no doubt, to this unhappy circumstance, and not to any thing connected with his own personal conduct or its consequences, and, least of all, to any circumstance or imagined consequence connected with the calm and placid hour of dissolution, that he alludes, when he assures his son, that the view of future punishment, in Mr. Simpson's pamphlet, “ would be a support to him in the most trying circumstances, as it had been to himself.” If this could possibly have admitted of a doubt, it would have been completely set aside, if one single sentence more had been printed of the beautiful letter addressed to Mr. Lindsey, April 15, 1803 (Life of Lindsey, App. p. 537). As the writer happens to possess a copy of that letter, he ventures (*suo periculo*) to subjoin it. After expressing his belief “ that even the wicked will, after a state of wholesome discipline, be raised in due time, to a state of happiness,” he adds, “ This is a very sensible relief to my mind, with respect to a person, whose relation to myself I cannot forget, and for whom I cannot forbear to feel most sensibly.”

* Although in the niceties of verbal criticism, for which, certainly, his other multifarious pursuits allowed little time, he was, no doubt, excelled by many others, his general familiarity with the Greek and Roman classics, as well as with the fathers of the Christian church, is manifest, not only in his Histories of Corruptions and Early Opinions, and in the controversies occasioned by them, but also in the wonderful variety and aptness of the mottos prefixed to his almost numberless publications, and in

Theory of Language, and on Oratory and Criticism, fully justified the expectations of the trustees concerning him. The former were printed for the use of the students, and were afterwards sanctioned by their adoption by Dr. Kippis, as his text-book at Hoxton, and were announced for publication with some supplementary ones of Dr. Kippis's, as a joint monument of their long friendship; but never appeared. They contain much ingenious and curious, and some very profound, research: in one place their author appears to have anticipated the discoveries of Mr. H. Tooke*.—The latter were published, during his residence with Lord Shelburne, with a handsome but truly independent, dedication, full of excellent advice, to Lord Fitzmaurice. Besides these lectures, having exchanged the teaching of logic and Hebrew, with Dr. Aikin, to whose department they seemed more naturally to belong, he composed courses of lectures on history and general policy, on the particular history of England, and on the laws and constitution of England;† and, in order to recommend the study of these subjects in a course of academical education, to the more general attention of the public, he drew up and published an "Essay on a Course of Liberal Education, for Civil and Active Life," to which he subjoined the Syllabus of these three new sets of Lectures. And as Dr. Brown, of Newcastle, had just then published a "Code of Education," which he recommended to be authoritatively established by the legislature, he added some remarks upon that treatise, in which he unanswerably demonstrated how inimical all compulsory plans of education are to liberty and the rights of parents. These, together with some remarks on church authority, in answer to Dr. Balguy, he afterwards incorporated in his incomparable Essay on Government, which deserves to be read and studied by every Englishman. The Lectures on History were afterwards published at large about the year 1790. And in order to facilitate the study of chronology, so justly termed one of the eyes of history, he drew up his Chart of Biography, on an idea as original as it is simple and perspicuous; and afterwards constructed a Chart of History, on a scale correspondent to it: the idea of which, however, was taken from a French historical chart, but considerably improved in many respects; particularly by causing the stream of time to flow uniformly through its whole extent, instead of having four different scales in different ages of the world, as in the French chart.

Dr. Priestley's mode of lecturing is described by himself, in the Essay above referred to, and also in the Preface to his Lectures on History. It was "to have his lecture drawn up in the form of a pretty full text-book, which he

---

the quickness and vivacity with which he applies quotations from the classics on every proper occasion. This trait in his literary character, which I have not seen noticed, would bear to be illustrated at considerable length.

* "Cooper's Analysis of Dr. Priestley's Works," p. 387.

† In drawing up this last course it is probable that he received considerable assistance from his excellent colleague above mentioned, whose knowledge of the subject may naturally be supposed to have been much more extensive and accurate than his own.

read and then illustrated by "a familiar address, questioning his pupils very particularly on the subject of the former lecture, before he proceeded to a new one; and on some of the subjects he had much more to say to the students, and to enquire of them, than on others. Also in going over the lectures a second time, he paid little regard to the divisions he had first made, but took in more or less matter, as he found convenient at the time." It is thus described by the excellent friend to whose communication the Essay on the Life of Dr. Aikin, has been so much indebted, who was his pupil, during the greatest part of his residence at Warrington.

"What Dr. Priestley added in discoursing from his written lectures (most of which are since published to the world,) was pointedly and clearly illustrative of the subject before him, and expressed with great simplicity and distinctness of language, though he sometimes manifested that difficulty of utterance which he mentions in the Memoirs of his Life. At the conclusion of his lecture, he always encouraged the students to express their sentiments relative to the subjects of it, and to urge any objections to what he had delivered without reserve. It pleased him when any one commenced such a conversation. In order to excite the freest discussion, he occasionally invited the students to drink tea with him, in order to canvass the subjects of his lectures. I do not recollect that he ever shewed the least displeasure at the strongest objections that were made to what he delivered; but I distinctly remember the smile of approbation with which he usually received them; nor did he fail to point out in a very encouraging manner, the ingenuity or force of any remarks that were made, when they merited these characters. His object, as well as Dr. Aikin's, was, to engage the students to examine and decide for themselves, uninfluenced by the sentiments of any other person. His written lectures he used to permit each student to take and read in his own lodgings. Those on rhetoric he gave them the liberty of copying, those on history of reading only, as he intended them for publication. From minutes in short-hand, he dictated to each student, by turns, one of the Lectures on History, who copied after him in long-hand. From this copy the Dr. told me they were printed, with some additions only relative to subsequent events.

"Without the least tincture of superstition or enthusiasm, both Dr. Aikin and Dr. Priestley endeavoured to instil into the minds of the students an habitual regard to good morals, and a veneration for the Supreme Being, and for the Christian Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, the great purpose and design of which, to instruct and improve mankind in piety and virtue, they judged to be best promoted by the most thorough, liberal and unbiassed inquiry into the evidence of their divine authority, and the true meaning of their contents.

"To have enjoyed the privilege, while young, of having such able, liberal and communicative instructors, I have always considered among the chief blessings of my life."

Such are the recollections of a

pupil worthy of their instructions, concerning the venerable guides of his youth.

Though no proficient in oratory himself, Dr. Priestley contrived to render himself very useful in the promotion of it among the students. He obtained the introduction of public weekly exercises, for the delivery of Latin and English compositions, and the recitation of passages, both in poetry and prose, calculated to improve the students in elocution, as well as to correct and refine their taste. His observations on their defects in speaking, and his directions how to remedy them, were very judicious; and he had the advantage of being able to refer them to excellent practical models in Dr. Aikin and Mr. Seddon. In assisting them to form a correct and elegant style, he was eminently qualified, not only by his thorough knowledge of the structure of the English language, displayed in his Lectures on Language, Oratory and Criticism, and in the Notes and Observations annexed to his Grammar, but also by his own example. For though in after-life, the multitude and variety of his writings, and the necessity which their rapid composition imposed upon him to attend to the matter rather than to the manner, occasioned them to be remarkable for sound sense, expressed in plain and perspicuous, but always vigorous, language, rather than for the correctness of the style and the polished elegance of the periods,* yet several of his earlier compositions, particularly the Sermon on the Duty of not Living to Ourselves, the Description of his Chart of Biography, and the Preface to his History of Electricity, are very finely written. His actual success, in contributing to the formation of very excellent writers, both in prose and verse, might be specified in several distinguished instances, within, and also without, the strict precincts of the academy.

Engaged, as he was, in lecturing, as he himself states, five hours each day, to his several classes, and much longer, probably, as he must have been, for several years, at least, in preparing for their delivery, and for the subsequent examination of the students, it is surprizing that he found the leisure to devote a considerable portion of time to the study of natural science, particularly that he should have been able in so short a time, to read for and compose so large a work as the History of Electricity. But his ardour in these pursuits had always been great, and this department of philosophy was recommended by its novelty and popularity, as well as by its intrinsically curious and striking nature: the encouragement, besides, of several eminent persons with whom it had brought him acquainted, operated a strong incitement to his speedy completion of a work, which contributed at once to his own fame and to the promotion of science.

Soon after his settlement at Warrington, he married a lady, whom he justly describes as "possessed of an excellent understanding, much improved by reading, of great fortitude and strength of mind, and of a temper in the highest degree affectionate and generous." This happy connection added greatly to his usefulness as well as his comfort; for it enabled him to take a number of the young men into his house as boarders, to their own great advantage, and it secured to him, both in their parents and in themselves, many valuable friendships, which were of great importance to him in the subsequent periods of his life. Mrs. Priestley's engaging manners and highly improving society attracted the warm attachment of many friends, particularly of Mrs. Barbauld, then Miss Aikin, whose deep regrets on her leaving Warrington, were expressed in one of the first and finest productions of her muse. Many other pieces from the same elegant pen, some of them published, but many also which have not been so, were produced by incidents connected with these excellent friends of her youth.

---

* "My object" says he of himself, p. 46, "was not to acquire the character of a fine writer, but of a useful one."

The society at Warrington was at this period singularly agreeable. The tutors lived in perfect harmony with each other, and with Mr. Seddon, the minister of the place, and the original projector of the academy; who, therefore, considered the institution as his child, and, as *Rector Academiæ*, kept up a constant intercourse both with the tutors and students, with the elder of whom he was very familiar, and was greatly beloved by them. The trustees, also, were perfectly satisfied with the general conduct of the institution, and, in the year 1762, were encouraged to build, in a more eligible situation, a common hall and library on a very handsome scale, together with two good houses for Dr. Priestley and Mr. Holt, Dr. Aikin being accommodated with a third house in the neighbourhood.

But notwithstanding these promising appearances, the prospects of the tutors were in several respects by no means promising. The subscriptions of distant contributors gradually fell off, and endangered a defalcation of the annual salaries: and, the terms which had been fixed for the board of students being unreasonably low (fifteen pounds a year) there was little room for a young tutor, with a lately-married delicate wife, and growing family, to flatter himself that he should be able to make provision for them. Perhaps his apprehensions of a failure of the academy were more readily indulged than they would otherwise have been, on the account of Mrs. Priestley's ill health, and the wish to make trial of a change of air, but, it is certain, that it was, in other respects, with great regret that he determined to separate from colleagues with whom he had lived so cordially, and to quit a situation which was in every respect agreeable to him, and which had now in a manner ceased to be laborious. To the great disappointment, however, and mortification of the trustees, he accepted an invitation to become the minister of the congregation at Mill-Hill chapel, in Leeds, whither he removed in 1767.—The rest of his active and eventful life forms no part of the history of this institution.

V. F.

[*To be continued.*]

EXTRACTS FROM NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Richards's History of the Royal Touch.

[Concluded from page 99.]

His brother and successor, *James* II. another of our *religious* monarchs, continued this practice with unabated zeal, solemnity and devotion. He appears to have made some improvement in the process; particularly by restoring the sign of the cross, which had been unaccountably omitted by his father and grandfather. It is probable that none of its ancient appendages were by him forgotten, or left unrestored, if he did not also, in his princely wisdom, devise some others equally suitable and edifying: and had the crown continued in his family, the good subjects of these realms would hardly have failed of having the institution or practice still preserved amongst them, and observed in all things according to the pattern exhibited by him. But his unexpected abdication forced things into another channel, and deprived us of so fair and important a chance. James is supposed to have practised at Whitehall as frequently, in proportion to the length of his reign, as his brother had done. But as his reign, compared with that of Charles, was very short, (though in some respects, much too long) it is not to be supposed that he, like the other, could boast of his myriads of patients and cures. It appears, however, that he was very assiduous in this business, as well when his occasions called him abroad, as when detained within the precincts of his own court or palace: hence when he went to Oxford in 1687, about the affair of Magdalen College and other matters, part of his time there is known to have been employed in *touching*: which shews how very partial he was to the practice, and how very ready he was to attend to it on every occasion that might offer.* *Dr. Sykes* in a letter to *Dr. Charlett*, of September 4, 1687, expresses himself thus, "This morning the king *touches* in Christ Church Quire; hears one Father Hall this morning at the new Popish Chapel there; but whether he will be there in the afternoon, or at University College, I know not." And *Creech* in a letter to *Dr. Charlett*, of September 6, the same year, says, "On Sunday morning the king *touched*, *Warner* and *White* officiating: all that waited on his majesty kneeled at the prayers, beside the Duke of Beaufort, who stood all the time."† All this shews how partial and devoted James was to this practice, as well as how obsequiously the learned Oxonians observed and contemplated this part of their sovereign's conduct. Had he not gone beyond this royal *touch*, neithe Magdalenians nor any other Oxonian fraternity had ever resisted his mandates: his popularity, in that case, might have been as unbounded as that of our present sovereign, and his descendants might have reigned here gloriously to this day.

---

* See the *Athenæum* for April and May, 1809.

† *Athenæum* as before.

At the Revolution this practice or operation was again suspended. *William* III. was a Presbyterian, and *Oliver Cromwell*, an Independent: the spirit and principles of these sects seem not to be congenial with, or favourable to the practice; nor does this gift or privilege appear to extend to sectarian or heterodox princes, but only to those of the Romish, or Church of England faith.

At the accession of *Anne*, of course, this sanative virtue and practice again revived, and numbers were *touched* by the royal hand of that illustrious princess, among whom was the late celebrated *Dr. Samuel Johnson*, then in his childhood. At the death of Anne, the said virtue forsook the British throne: at least, none of our succeeding monarchs have yet ventured to revive the practice. The two first princes of the present dynasty had, doubtless, their reasons for refraining from it; but as it is not known what they were, it is impossible to say whether their majesties were governed therein by wise or unwise, proper or improper, motives. We know that actions very right in themselves may yet be performed upon very wrong and unjustifiable principles. There is, however, no room to suppose that these two potentates, were in any measure influenced, in this instance, by what their enemies, the Jacobites, would be ready to insinuate;—an apprehension of their own title to the crown being defective. The voice of the nation (than which there can be no better title) had placed them on the throne of these realms.

His present majesty has hitherto followed the example of his two immediate predecessors, in not restoring or resuming this dormant or neglected branch of the royal prerogative. If he ever should hereafter, at any time, think proper to restore or resume it, there can be no manner of doubt of his meeting with ample success, as well as abundant employment. In that case it may be presumed that multitudes of patients would soon be flocking in from all quarters, not excepting the county of Norfolk and the parts about Lynn Regis. His resolving to resume the practice would instantly occasion the revival of the national faith in the efficacy of the operation; and so far would such a resumption or experiment be from endangering his majesty's fair fame and popularity, that it would, in all probability, augment the same, and so render him for the residue of his reign, within the British isles at least, more popular and more celebrated than ever. But as we are not warranted to expect that his majesty will ever try the experiment, or put to the test the faith of his subjects in the miraculous efficacy of his *touch*, we shall here drop the subject as far as it may concern him.

It appears that after the death of Queen *Anne*, it was firmly believed by a great part of the nation, that the sanative virtue or miraculous power which she was allowed to possess, still existed in the person of a certain exiled prince of her family. In proof of which a story was industriously propagated of one *Christopher Lovel*, of Bristol, who being most sadly and grievously afflicted with the evil, after having recourse to the most eminent of the faculty, and availed himself of the best medical help in vain, went at last to the continent, in quest of the said prince. Having found his royal highness, and been kindly received, he underwent the operation of the *touch*, got perfectly cured, and returned home safe and sound, in full health and high spirits, after an absence of four months and some few days. Carte, the historian, and many more, gentlemen of the faculty as well as others, visited him, examined the case thoroughly, and pronounced the cure complete. Some of them, of whom one was Dr. *Lane*, an eminent physician, considered it as one of the most extraordinary and wonderful events that had ever happened. After this, who can doubt the reality of the fact, that such a sanative virtue, gift or power, was actually possessed by the said prince?—It seems, however, that the miracle did not effect a radical cure: poor Lovel relapsed again sometime after, and died of the evil at last. Such, in all probability, were all the other great cures performed by the rest of our royal doctors, although many of them, like this, were attested as *perfect cures*, by very respectable but too credulous witnesses.

It is somewhat remarkable that *Whiston*, as well as *Carte*, believed in the efficacy of the royal touch: the former derives it from the *prayer* used at the time, while the latter seems to consider it as a divine or miraculous gift bestowed upon, or inherent to all the rightful heirs to the English throne. Both of them were men of considerable respectability, and very confident, it seems, of the soundness of their respective opinions in this case. Their opinions, however, appear equally untenable, and may, pretty safely, be pronounced utterly unfounded. The favourable effects, or apparent benefit which some of those patients might experience after having undergone the operation of the *touch*, must doubtless be ascribed to their own operative faith and strength of imagination, rather than to any supernatural virtue proceeding from that princely performance, or any miraculous gift possessed by the royal practitioners. To the same cause must also be attributed the salutary effects said to have sometimes resulted from the pretended animal magnetism, as well as such empirical charms and nostrums as have acquired an uncommon share of popular fame, or have stood very high in the good opinion of the public. A patient's favourable opinion of a remedy administered to him, and his very confident expectation of deriving from it very essential benefit, are allowed to have had a happy effect, and to have done great things sometimes in very serious and dangerous cases.

Now we may rest assured that on no other ground but this can we reasonably account for benefits experienced by many who underwent the royal touch; admitting that to have been really the case; for it is too absurd to suppose that those royal personages were actually endowed with power to work miracles, or that the ceremony performed, or yet the gold given to the patients to wear about their necks, had in them any supernatural or healing virtue, to render them capable of producing such effects.

It must be rather mortifying to our national vanity and pride, to think that our dear ancestors, for seven hundred years, firmly believed in the miraculous efficacy of the royal touch in scrofulous complaints.* But while we reprobate, or pity their stupid and miserable credulity, in this and other instances, let us not forget that we ourselves are not without our errors and failings, and those no less inexcusable and degrading: witness our general belief in witchcraft, conjuration, prodigies and newspapers, together with the unshaken faith of multitudes in *Richard Brothers, Joanna Southcott,* and many other notorious impostors of different descriptions: and it may be justly questioned, if there ever was a period when the inhabitants of this country have been more inexcusably credulous, more easily and egregiously imposed upon, or more generally and universally duped, than in this very age.—But we will here close this long section; hoping that its contents will not fail to contribute, at least in some measure, to the amusement and satisfaction of the inquisitive and candid reader; especially if he ever wished to learn the history of the royal touch, of which he will find here, perhaps, a more particular and circumstantial account than in any other publication.

---

* Would not the case have been the same with their descendants of the present generation, had our three last monarchs thought proper to continue the practice, or the present sovereign chose to revive it?—How strikingly was the easy faith of the nation exemplified in the implicit credit it gave to a late premier's possessing extraordinary and plenary ability to heal all the national or political maladies of Britain, of Europe, and of the world? And had he pretended to a power to cure the scrofula, or any other bodily complaint, with his *touch*, would it not have been readily believed by all his numerous admirers, and by the greatest part of our countrymen? And would not numerous witnesses have soon appeared, ready to attest the reality and completeness of his cures?—Circumstances seem evidently to favour these conclusions: nor will the story of the *Dumb Doctor*, still fresh in every body's memory, (not to mention other cases) allow of our making here an exception in favour of the inhabitants of Lynn.

For the sake of those readers who live at a distance from Lynn, the affair here last alluded to may require some explanation. Be it known, therefore, that the empirical adventurer, called the *Dumb Doctor*, made his appearance at Lynn about four and twenty years ago; and for a good while after, spent most of his time between this town and Wisbeach. It was given out that he had been deaf and dumb from his birth, and that he was a native of New England, or some part of North America, where he had, somehow, (miraculously, or at least in some very extraordinary and wonderful manner no doubt) acquired very deep knowledge and skill in the healing art; and after having performed great and astonishing cures in his own country, had actually crossed the wide Atlantic out of pure kindness and compassion to the sick and infirm folk of this kingdom, most of whose complaints he might be expected capable of removing.—The tale very generally took with our good townsmen, and numbers of ailing people, gentle and simple, well-bred and ill-bred, from all quarters, flocked to the impostor for relief. Not a few of them also declared that they had actually derived great benefit from his prescriptions.—Thus he went on very prosperously, till an old acquaintance of his unluckily came to town, blew him up, and blasted all his hopes. He then suddenly decamped, and was never since seen or heard of in these parts.—It seems he had belonged to a company of strolling players, from which honourable fraternity he had been, on some occasion, expelled: upon which he took up the medical profession, pretending to be deaf and dumb, and a native of North America, as was before stated.—This may serve to shew that with all our scepticism and infidelity, and our large stock of fancied light and discernment, learning and refinement, we are by no means so far removed from the easy faith and blind credulity of our ancestors, or become such complete proofs against the wiles of imposture, or the specious arts of daring deceivers, as might be supposed, from our confident, loud and boisterous boastings.

P. S. Since the section on the royal touch has been printed off, a paper has appeared in the *Monthly Magazine*, under the signature of *I. Bannantine*, which casts some further light upon that subject. As it is presumed it will not be unacceptable to the reader, we take the liberty of inserting here the substance of it.—"It does not appear (says that writer) that any of the House of Brunswick have asserted this royal function; at least, it has not been publicly announced, as was formerly the practice: but were his present majesty to resume it, such faith is yet put in the assertion of a king, that all the courtiers and the great body of the ignorant multitude would not hesitate to believe its infallibility. The last sovereign who appears to have exercised this miraculous gift was Queen *Anne*. In the Royal Gazette of March 12, 1712, appears the following public notice: 'It being her majesty's royal intention to touch publicly for the evil, the 17th of this instant March, and so to continue for sometime, it is her majesty's command, that tickets be delivered the day before at Whitehall; and that all persons bring a certificate signed by the minister and churchwardens of their respective parishes, that they *never received the royal touch*.'—He further adds, that *Wiseman*, sergeant surgeon to Chas. 2nd, in a Treatise on the Evil, speaks of the *royal touch* in the following terms: 'I have myself been frequent eye-witness of many hundreds of cures performed by his majesty's touch alone, without the assistance of chirurgery, and those many of them such as had tired out the endeavours of able chirurgeons before they came thither. It were endless to relate what I myself have seen, and what I have received acknowledgement of by letters, not only from the several parts of the nation, but also from Ireland, Scotland, Jersey and Germany.'—It was the office of Wiseman, as sergeant surgeon, to select such afflicted objects as were proper to be presented for the royal touch.—Is it possible (I. Bannantine here exclaims) to desire a more satisfactory testimony of these miraculous cures, than that of a man of science and respectability, under whose immediate inspection they were performed, and who had 'himself been a frequent eye-witness of many hundreds of cures performed by his majesty's touch alone!'—The late judge Barrington (he further observes) relates what he heard from an old man, a witness in a cause, with regard to this miraculous power of healing.—'He had by his evidence fixed the time of a fact, by Queen Anne's having been at Oxford, and touched him, whilst a child, for the evil. When he had finished his evidence, I had an opportunity of asking him whether he really was cured? Upon which he observed, with a significant smile, that he believed himself never to have had a complaint that deserved to be considered as the evil; but that his parents were poor, and *had no objection to the bit of gold.*" It seems to me (adds the judge) this piece of gold, that was given to those who were touched, accounts for the great resort on this occasion, and the supposed afterwards miraculous cures.—*Gimelli*, the famous traveller, gives an account of 1600 persons offering themselves to be cured of the evil by Lewis XIV. on Easter Sunday, 1686. Gimelli himself was present at the ceremony: every Frenchman received 15 sous, and every foreigner 30 This power of healing assumed by the kings of France, occasioned great resort to Francis I. while prisoner at Madrid, by the Spaniards, who had not such faith in their own king's touch. It appears by a proclamation of James I. March 25, 1617, that the kings of England would not permit any resort to them for these miraculous cures in the summer-time. By another proclamation of June 18, 1626, it is ordered that no one shall apply for this purpose, who does not bring a proper certificate, that he has never been touched before: the same, it has been already seen, were the terms on which *Queen Anne* granted her royal touch.—In a prayer-book printed in 1703, is a form of the church-service, for the occasion of the royal touch. After the Lord's Prayer it is stated, "Then shall the infirm persons, one by one, be presented to the queen; while the queen is laying her hands upon them and is putting the gold about their necks, the chaplain that officiates, turning himself to her majesty, shall say these words following: "God give a blessing to this work, and grant that these sick persons on whom the queen lays her hands may recover through Jesus Christ our Lord!"—After some other prayers, the chaplain, standing with his face towards those come to be healed, shall say: "The Almighty God, who is a most strong tower to all them that put their trust in him, to whom all things in heaven, in earth, and under the earth, do bow and obey, be evermore your defence; and make you know and feel that there is no other name under heaven given to man, and through whom you may receive health and salvation, but only in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ! Amen!" *Mon. Mag. March*, 1810.

AN ADDRESS TO THE PROTESTANTS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND. BY CHARLES BUTLER, ESQ. OF LINCOLN'S INN.

[*Concluded from p.* 161.]

The Oath and Declaration prescribed by the British Parliament of the 31st of his present Majesty, and which is taken by all English Catholics.

"I *A. B.* do hereby declare, that I do profess the Roman Catholic religion.

"I *A. B.* do sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faithful, and bear true Allegiance to his majesty, King George the Third, and him will defend to the utmost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts whatsoever that shall be made against his person, crown or dignity: and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to his majesty, his heirs and successors, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies which may be formed against him or them: and I do faithfully promise to maintain, support and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the crown; which succession, by an act, intituled 'An Act for the further Limitation of the crown, and better securing the rights and liberties of the subject,' is, and stands limited to the princess Sophia, Electress and Duchess Dowager of Hanover, and the heirs of her body being Protestants; hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto any other person claiming or pretending a right to the crown of these realms. And I do swear, that I do reject and detest, as an unchristian and impious position, that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for, or under pretence of, their being heretics or infidels; and also that unchristian and impious principle, that faith is not to be kept with heretics or infidels: and I further declare, that it is not an article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject and abjure the opinion, that princes excommunicated by the pope and council, or any authority of the see of Rome, or by any authority whatsoever, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any person whatsoever: and I do promise, that I will not hold, maintain, or abet any such opinion, or any other opinions contrary to what is expressed in this declaration: and I do declare, that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign prince, prelate, state or potentate, hath or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm: and I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever, and without any dispensation already granted by the Pope, or any authority of the see of Rome, or any person whatever, and without thinking that I am, or can be, acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or authority whatsoever, shall dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null or void. So help me God."

The Oaths and Declarations prescribed by the Acts of the Irish Parliament to Irish Roman Catholics.

The first is *the Oath of Allegiance and Declaration*, prescribed by the Irish Act of the 13th and 14th of his present Majesty; and is taken by all Irish Roman Catholics.

"I *A. B.* do take almighty God, and his only Son Jesus Christ, my Redeemer, to witness, that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to our most gracious sovereign Lord King George the Third, and him will defend to the utmost of my power, against all conspiracies and attempts whatsoever that shall be made against his person, crown and dignity; and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to his majesty, and his heirs, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies, which may be formed against him or them; and I do faithfully promise to maintain, support and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the crown in his majesty's family, against any person or persons whatsoever, hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto the person taking upon himself the style and title of Prince of Wales, in the lifetime of his father, and who since his death is said to have assumed the style and title of King of Great Britain and Ireland, by the name of Charles the Third, and to any other person claiming or pretending a right to the crown of these realms: and I do swear, that I do reject and detest, as unchristian and impious to believe, that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for or under pretence of their being heretics, and also that unchristian and impious principle that no faith is to be kept with heretics: I further declare, that it is no article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject and abjure, the opinion that princes excommunicated by the Pope and Council, or by any authority of the see of Rome, or by any authority whatsoever, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any person whatsoever; and I do promise, that I will not hold, maintain, or abet, any such opinion, or any other opinion, contrary to what is expressed in this declaration: and I do declare, that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign prince, prelate, state or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm: and I do solemnly in the presence of God, and of his only Son Jesus Christ, my Redeemer, profess, testify and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever, and without any dispensation already granted by the Pope, or any authority of the see of Rome, or any person whatever, and without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or persons or authority whatsoever, shall dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning. So help me God."

The Oath and Declaration prescribed by the Irish Act of the 33d of his present Majesty, and which is taken by all Irish Roman Catholics, wishing to entitle themselves to the benefit of that Act.

"I *A. B.* do hereby declare, that I do profess the Roman Catholic religion.

"I. *A. B.* do swear that I do abjure, condemn and detest, as unchristian and impious, the principle that it is lawful to murder destroy, or any ways injure, any persons whatsoever, for or under the pretence of being a heretic: and I do declare solemnly before God, that I believe, that no act in itself unjust, immoral, or wicked, can ever be justified or excused, by or under pretence or colour that it was done either for the good of the church, or in obedience to any ecclesiastical power whatsoever: I also declare, that it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither am I thereby required to believe or profess, that the Pope is infallible, or that I am bound to obey any order, in its own nature immoral, though the Pope, or any ecclesiastical power, should issue or direct such order; but on the contrary I hold that it would be sinful in me to pay any respect or obedience thereto: I further declare, that I do not believe, that any sin whatever committed by me, can be forgiven, at the mere will of any Pope or any priest, or of any person or persons whatsoever, but that sincere sorrow for past sins, a firm and sincere resolution to avoid future guilt, and to atone to God, are previous and indispensable requisites to establish a well-founded expectation of forgiveness; and that any person who receives absolution without these previous requisites, so far from obtaining thereby any remission of his sins, incurs the additional guilt of violating a sacrament: and I do swear, that I will defend, to the uttermost of my power the settlement and arrangement of property in this country, as established by the laws now in being: I do hereby disclaim, disavow and solemnly abjure, any intention to subvert the present church establishment, for the purpose of substituting a Catholic establishment in its stead: and I do solemnly swear, that I will not exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled, to disturb and weaken the Protestant religion and Protestant government in this kingdom. So help me God."

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. Belsham on the Controversy between Dr. Priestley and Bp. Horsley; in reply to the Strictures of the Rev. H. Horsley, on the Calm Inquiry.—Letter II.

Essex House, April 5, 1813.

Sir,

Having I trust sufficiently exculpated myself from the heavy charge of impiety and blasphemy in asserting that an archdeacon was well satisfied at being made a bishop, I might now proceed to state and examine the less formidable allegations of my reverend opponent. But that your readers may better understand the subjects of discussion, I will in this letter exhibit a brief sketch of the controversy betwen Dr. Priestley and Dr. Horsely.

Dr. Priestley in his First Series of Letters to Dr. Horsley, appeals to Origen as asserting that the Jewish Christians were in general called Ebionites, and that of these, some believed and some disbelieved the miraculous conception, but that all of them considered Jesus as a mere man.

Dr. Horsley, upon the authority of Mosheim, taxes the veracity of Origen, and charges him with *notorious falsehood*, in asserting that the Hebrew Christians, in general had not renounced the Mosaic law: as Origen must have known that after the emperor Adrian had destroyed Jerusalem, and founded in its neighbourhood the city of Ælia, from which all Jews were excluded under pain of death; the majority of Hebrew Christians, who, to avoid the calamities of war, had retired to Pella and its vicinity, when the war was over, renounced the Mosaic ritual, that they might not be taken for Jews, and returned in great numbers to Ælia, that they might enjoy the privileges of the Ælian colony.

Dr. Priestley not having Mosheim's Ante-Constantine History at hand, to which the archdeacon had referred, and not finding in that learned writer's General Ecclesiastical History, all the circumstances which Dr. Horsley had mentioned in his Second Series of Letters, warmly defends the character of Origen, accuses the archdeacon of having added various particulars to the narrative of Mosheim, ridicules the supposition of a sudden dereliction of the rites of the law, for the sake of securing the municipal privileges of Ælia, and treats the whole account of the establishment of an orthodox Jewish church at Ælia, as an incredible tale, contradictory to all history, which uniformly represents the church at Ælia as consisting wholly of gentile believers, under Marcus, a gentile bishop. Dr. Priestley concludes with accusing his learned opponent as "a falsifier of history and a defamer of the character of the dead."

The archdeacon, stung to the quick by the reproach of his adversary, in his reply, though he contends for the "necessity of "helping out by conjecture, the broken accounts of ancient writers," indignantly repels the charge of inventing his facts, and pleads the authority of Mosheim, for all that he had advanced, both with regard to the character of Origen, and the existence of a church of Hebrew Christians at Ælia. But finding that he had leaned too much upon the credit of Mosheim, whose authorities did not, in fact, warrant his assertions, Dr. Horsley set himself in good earnest to search for evidence, both to support his charge against Origen, and to establish his orthodox Jewish church at Ælia. In respect to the former, he introduces two quotations from Origen's reply to Celsus, which are very far indeed from proving his accusation: and to support the latter he cites a passage from Jerome, which speaks of Nazarenes, in his time, who believed in Christ. These the archdeacon concludes could be no other than the orthodox descendants of the orthodox church at Ælia.

To confirm his position that the Hebrew Christians after Adrian's settlement of the Ælian colony, returned from Pella, whither they had retired from the distresses of the war, to Ælia, the archdeacon appeals to the authority of Epiphanius, who states that after the desolation of Jerusalem, the disciples returned from Pella, and were residing at Jerusalem, or, says the archdeacon, "more properly Ælia," at the time that Aquila resided there, as overseer of the emperor Adrian's works. But he at the same time very prudently deprecates, and warns his good-natured readers not to regard, chronological cavils.

Notwithstanding this, Dr. Priestley in his Third Series of Letters, states, in the first place, that the Christians, of whom Epiphanius speaks, were not those who returned from Pella after Adrian's demolition of Jerusalem, but those who came back, after the war of Vespasian, sixty years before that of Adrian: and secondly, that Aquila was employed by Adrian at Jerusalem, antecedently to the breaking out of the war, and consequently, that the Christians whom he saw and conversed with there, could not be those who returned from Pella, after the war, to enjoy the privileges of the Ælian colony. These two facts completely subvert the foundation of that fine history of the orthodox Hebrew Church, at Ælia, which the archdeacon had borrowed from Mosheim, upon the authority of Epiphanius.

The learned dignitary, now advanced to the See of St. David's, thus finding the whole body of these pious and orthodox emigrants returned upon his hands, could devise no better way of disposing of them, than by keeping them at home, where, as he is pleased to tell his readers, upon his own authority, for he does not even pretend the sanction of history, they behaved very orderly and peaceably, during the Jewish rebellion, and therefore were not included in the emperor's edict, for the banishment of the Jews, but were permitted to settle quietly at Ælia. And though his lordship confesses that they were neither required by the emperor, nor tempted by any promise of civil privileges, to forsake the Mosaic ritual, yet such was the exemplary prudence of these "holy brethren," that they abandoned at once the customs of their forefathers, to which they themselves likewise had been so early, and so fondly attached, and placed themselves under the pastoral care of a gentile bishop, lest by the Roman magistrates they should be mistaken for Jews. The learned prelate having thus "helped out a broken story by his own conjectures," and having introduced these "saints of the primitive church" into good quarters in the Ælian colony, now bids them farewell, and fairly leaves "the holy brethren," to take the best care they can of themselves. "The disturbed foundations of the church of Ælia," says he, "are again settled. I could wish to leave them to their own solidity, to withstand any future attacks." Nor does it, indeed appear that his lordship ever enquired after them any more, or gave himself any further trouble about them.

This new edifice, lighter than air, falls of course to the ground at the touch of Dr. Priestley's wand. The indefatigable and undaunted champion of the divine unity after challenging his learned opponent to renew the charge, advises him for the future, to build his churches of sounder materials, and that when he professes to write history, he would not entirely disregard the humble subject of chronology. Thus content with his victory he retires from the field: but though the exertions of his adversary were rewarded with a mitre, I am forbidden to say that the bishop was *equally well satisfied* with the result of the discussion.

The character of Origen and the existence of an orthodox Hebrew church at Ælia, which discarded the rites of the law are the principal topics of controversy between Dr. Horsley and Dr. Priestley. Other questions, however, of minor importance, occasionally intervened. Tertullian asserts that the majority of unlearned believers (idiotæ) in his time entertained the greatest horror and abhorrence of the doctrine of the Trinity. The bishop, to diminish the weight of Tertullian's testimony, translates *idiotæ*, idiots. No one can suppose that Dr. Horsley was serious in this mistranslation. It is not probable that he expected that it would impose even upon the most ignorant of his readers. Yet Dr. Priestley takes it up very seriously, and charges his opponent with gross ignorance. And the bishop who wished for nothing more than to divert the attention of his readers from the main question, with all due gravity defends his translation, and alledges the authority of Calepine, Ainsworth and others, to justify the sense which he puts upon the word. But he would not for a moment maintain that the common idea annexed to the English word idiot, was the sense in which Tertullian used the word idiotæ. And this memorable passage, even according to Dr. Horsley's own translation of it, remains an indisputable and a most illustrious proof of the prevalence of the Unitarian doctrine among the great body of unlearned christians at the end of the second century, and of their aversion to every infringement upon that primary and most important truth, the unity of God.

Dr. Horsley also lays considerable stress upon the epistle of Barnabas as containing the testimony of a writer of the apostolic age, to the orthodoxy of the Hebrew christians. Dr. Priestley contends that the epistle is interpolated. But Jeremiah Jones with more propriety rejects it altogether, as the silly forgery of some Alexandrian Jew of the second century.

This sketch of the controversy between Dr. Priestley and Dr. Horsley will enable your readers to understand the questions in discussion between the Prebendary of St. Asaph, and the Reviewer of the controversy in the Calm Inquiry. With this review the reverend Prebendary professes to be greatly dissatisfied. And if sneers, sarcasms, misquotations, misrepresentations, and verbal cavilling, is to stand for argument, the cause is lost. But as to any thing which resembles the love of truth, fairness of statement, cogency of reasoning, or indeed any knowledge at all of the subject, the reader will look for it in vain through the vaunting pages of this logician of the North.

In one point I agree with my reverend opponent. And as this is almost our only common ground, I will beg leave to state it before I conclude. The reverend Prebendary sets out with the following remark. "Bishop Horsley has declared, that in publishing the tracts his object was not to bring forward any new argument in support of the divinity of our blessed Lord, or of the catholic doctrine of the Trinity, but to *destroy the credit of an author by whom these doctrines had been attacked*, by shewing, that as an ecclesiastical historian, and a Greek scholar, he had no claim to such deference as had been generally paid him in the character of a chemical philosopher."

Yes Sir, this is a true state of the fact. It was the avowed design of Bishop Horsley to destroy the credit of Dr. Priestley as an ecclesiastical historian, both as to learning and integrity. It was his professed intention to represent Dr. Priestley as totally incompetent to the task which he had undertaken, as too deficient in learning to understand the authorities to which he appeals, as hazarding assertions without proofs, and as from prejudice or ignorance continually mistaking, or perverting, the meaning of the passages which he cites. Happily, in this generous purpose the learned prelate has entirely failed. Here and there he has indeed discovered an error, or pointed out a mistranslation: and more no doubt might have been added. But they are such as do not in the least degree affect Dr. Priestley's general conclusion. And in the points at issue between him and the learned prelate, the victory of the great advocate for the divine unity was decisive and complete. This the Bishop well knew. And though his lordship was no doubt gratified to see the effect produced by his pompous and imposing style upon the unthinking crowd, he would have been the first to laugh to scorn the solemn ignoramus, who should seriously profess to believe that the advantage of the argument remained with him. No Sir, Bishop Horsley knew that he had inadvertently given too much credit to the great name of Mosheim. He knew that Mosheim's authorities would not bear out his assertions. He knew that he had in vain sought for other authorities to support Mosheim. He knew that having failed in these he had sported a hypothesis of his own which would not bear examination for a moment. He knew that in this state he had retired from the field, leaving his adversary in full possession of the ground. All this the bishop knew, though his son may not; nor am I afraid of being contradicted in this statement by any one who is qualified to judge in the case, and who is under no bias to conceal his opinions.

In my next letter I propose to enter more directly into the refutation of my adversary's cavils. In the mean time,

I am, Sir, &c.

T. BELSHAM.

Letter from Dr. Benson to Mr. Towgood.

Exeter, April 2, 1813.

Sir,

The following Letter from Dr. Benson to Mr. Towgood, was put into my hands by the daughter of the latter. Should you think it deserving a place in your useful Repository, the insertion of it will oblige

Your obedient humble servant,

JAMES MANNING.

London, Feb. 20, 1758.

"Dear Sir,

"I have herewith sent you a copy of a letter concerning conformity, &c. I was desirous you should see it because I hope you are proceeding in your answer to Powel's Sermon concerning subscription to the 39 articles in any sense, in every sense, and in no sense at all; as articles of truth which are not true; as articles of peace which create endless contentions; as articles of the church of England, which the Divines of that church commonly confute; as articles made to prevent diversity of opinions, and which greatly encrease diversity of opinions; as articles made in the days of bigotry by men who had no critical skill in the Scriptures, to fetter the ages of learning and free enquiry. And yet for 500*l*. per annum, or less money, there are men who will subscribe, who will contend for subscribing to these same articles, whether ministers believe them or not—

—Pudet hæc opprobria—.

I am pleased that I have had the happiness to see you once. I shall never see you more in this world. I am delighted with the prospect of meeting you in a better state, where there are no subscriptions to articles required, no bigotry, nor any thing to grieve or offend any more.

With great esteem for you,
I am,
Yours sincerely,
GEORGE BENSON.

Future State of Infants on the Calvinistic Scheme.

Dec. 1, 1812.

SIR,

The letter-writer whom you copy (vol. VII. p. 682.) supposes that modern Calvinists confine salvation to *the dead infants of the elect*. I rather think they indulge a vague, unauthorized notion, that all who are born to die in infancy were included in the covenant of election. Thus the famous assertion, that *there are infants in hell of a span long*, is given up as the rant of some wild fanatic. Yet it is remarkable that *Baxter*, whose scheme has been supposed to soften the rigours of Calvinism, inclined to the unmerciful notion on the subject of infants' salvation.

I have a very small volume (1655), entitled "*A Sermon of Judgment, preached at Paul's, before the Honourable Lord Maior and Aldermen of the City of London, Dec.* 17, 1654, *and now enlarged by Richard Baxter.*" At p. 33, is the following passage:—"Obj. *But how shall Infants be judged by the Gospel, that were incapable of it?* Answer, *For ought I find in scripture, they stand or fall with their parents, and on the same terms.* But I leave each to their own thoughts."

At p. 156, Baxter affords the following curious specimen of theological *special-pleading*. "The eight-and-twentieth excuse, *How could I be saved if Christ did not die for me? He died but for his elect, and none could be saved without his death.* Answer. He *did* die for you, and for more than his elect; though he absolutely purposed only their salvation." This reminds me of a verse in which one of the *Wesleys* exposed the *moderate* Calvinism of their time—

He did not do the ruthless deed
Some have more mildly rav'd,
God did not *damn them*, but decreed
They never should be sav'd.

Is not the same said in prose by the ablest modern advocates for Calvinism? When I once looked into Dr. Williams's Reply to the Bishop of Lincoln, he appeared to me to rob the system of Calvin, of its grand, though horrible consistency; cutting off its natural growth, *reprobation*, and substituting *preterition*, a mere exotic.

IGNOTUS.

A Curious Baptism.

SIR, *Feb.* 21, 1813.

Perhaps the account of a baptism which took place in Dublin, about six years ago, may, for its singularity, be worthy of a place in your Repository.

A Moor and a native of Mogadore, Africa,—a strict observer of the religion of Mahomet,—wearing always, of course, the costume of his country, resided a few months in the above city; a family where he occasionally visited, about to baptize their infant, solicited the stranger to stand *Godfather*, which was immediately consented to, and on the appointed day, he appeared splendidly arrayed in his turban and robes at the sacred font, where with due solemnity, he answered to the accustomed interrogatives,—"All this I stedfastly believe." To add still further to the oddity of the circumstance, the father was a member of the Roman Catholic church, and the mother of the Established one.

I. W.

Theological Queries.

Appleby, Feb. 22, 1813.

Sir,

Being a reader of your valuable work, and as it is a work chiefly designed to promote freedom of inquiry, I trust you will judge no subject unworthy of investigation which stands connected with the promotion of Christian virtue.—Entering most cordially into the same design with yourself, I have taken the liberty of sending a few queries for insertion, if you shall think them proper for it, hoping they may bring forth the abilities of some of your candid and liberal correspondents.

1st, Are we who live under the dispensation of the gospel, to be considered as having a *complete guide* to all Christian faith, and practice when we possess the *New Testament only*?

If not, how can it be said that Christ was faithful in all his house as Moses was faithful, see Heb. iii. 2.—If complete, does this bind us to reject all doctrines and practices which are not recorded there, and to receive all that are recorded?

2nd, Are we to consider obedience to what are called positive commands and institutions, as constituting any part of that morality or virtue *essentially* necessary to the Christian character? Or may these be neglected and yet our characters stand approved with God?

These subjects have occupied the writer's attention for some time, and it would afford him great pleasure to see them discussed somewhat at large.

I am, Sir,
PHILOS.

Unitarian Associations.

Sir, *Feb.* 16, 1813.

Situated, as I am, out of the way of information, excepting through the medium of your valuable Repository, I feel great pleasure in reflecting upon the very great advantages arising to the cause of Christianity from the exertions of individuals, as well as from bodies of Christians therein recorded; and I am very thankful to the Divine Being for the pleasure I enjoy in the perusal of this valuable publication from time to time. In your No. for July last, an account is given of the Annual Meeting of the Warwickshire, Western and Southern Unitarian Book Societies. It has frequently occurred to me that the Reports of these meetings ought to be more generally known. Communication is the life of Society, and why not of Christianity? Certainly it is as applicable to the last as to the first. I sit down with a small congregation of Unitarians, the majority of whom are totally ignorant of these societies and consequently of these meetings; or of the existence of any active proceedings by bodies or societies of men in the cause of rational religion;—nor do they know of the existence of the York Academy, the New Institution in London, or of the Fund. I do not mean to insinuate that the minister is ignorant of these institutions, or that *all* who sit under him are so, but that the majority is, there can be no doubt, and those too who ought particularly to be informed —I mean the lower order. To prevent the continuance of this evil, permit me, Sir, to suggest what to me appears to be an easy and an effectual remedy, and which I shall submit to your better judgment by way of query. Would it not be a great benefit to Unitarian churches, if the Fund in London, and other Unitarian institutions there; the Committee of the York Academy, and every Unitarian association throughout the kingdom, were to impress (by circulars or otherwise) upon each and every minister of a congregation, the necessity of dedicating the fore part of a Sabbath, once a year, (or oftener, as Reports may be made from these institutions,) in reading these Reports? Service may begin with prayer, and end with a hymn and prayer.

It is a well known fact, that most bodies of our dissenting brethren have recourse to every popular method to inform their respective congregations of the general union of the different branches or members of their general body,—thus keeping alive a universal feeling of religious affection, as well as of local interest. Why shall Unitarians be left at so great a distance in religious zeal?

Many times have I wished to communicate these thoughts, but diffidence and want of ability, such as the subject deserves, has prevented me. I shall now, however, submit them, without fear to your candid consideration, being well assured of your readiness to give them your serious attention, as well as the sanction of your recommendation. I. P.

On the Placability of God.

Ringwood, Dec. 4, 1812.

Sir,

I am induced to call the attention of your readers to a few considerations on this subject, by perusing certain "Remarks on the Quakers' Epistle for 1812," in your number for October, (vol. vii. p. 611). The author of those Remarks appears to labour under similar misconceptions with those which are common to his sect, in regard to the *real* sentiments of all rational and moderate Calvinists, on this article. He seems to consider it as their avowed belief, that the death of Christ was "the *cause* of the placability of God:"—a notion which not one in ten thousand, of those who cordially maintain the doctrine of satisfaction for sin, would, for a moment, tolerate. In reality, the principle which the remarker attributes to "the early Friends," and to the majority of their descendants, in the present day, is precisely that of the persons he opposes;—viz. "that God's love is not the *effect* of Christ's satisfaction," but that "*Christ is the proper gift and effect of God's love.*" They believe, as firmly as the remarker can possibly do, that "the boundless mercy and goodness of God," is the sole, original cause of our salvation, though that mercy exhibits itself and operates exclusively through the medium of the Redeemer's death upon the cross, as a suitable attestation to the divine abhorrence of sin, as a glorious display of the Divine character, and a necessary vindication of the divine government. That sentiments somewhat varying from this representation,—sentiments describing the Deity as wrathful and vindictive, appeased only by the extreme sufferings of a Mediator, *may* be found in some of our devout poets, or in the pages of some over-zealous controversalists, is easily admitted. But who that possesses a grain of common candour or common sense, would estimate the opinions of a whole community by so narrow a standard? Let the writings of our many respectable and authorised divines both ancient and modern, be rather allowed to express our real views.

And here, (while it would be easy to adduce testimony from many other sources, equally decisive,) let me crave permission to quote a few passages from a work which well deserves the profound study of men of all parties.

"The doctrine of atonement," say its opposers, "is founded on the *Divine implacability*, inasmuch as it supposes, that to appease the rigid justice of God, it was requisite that punishment should be inflicted; and that, consequently, the sinner *could* not, by any means, have been released, had not Christ suffered in his stead. Were this a faithful statement of the doctrine of atonement, there had indeed been just ground for the objection. But this is not the fair representation of candid truth.—Although it is through the merits and intercession of Christ, that we are forgiven; yet these were not the *procuring cause*, but the *means*, by which God, originally disposed to forgive, thought it right to bestow his pardon.—

"The sacrifice of Christ was never deemed by any, who did not wish to calumniate the doctrine of atonement, to have *made* God placable, but merely viewed as the *means* appointed by divine wisdom, by which to bestow forgiveness. And agreeably to this, do we not find this sacrifice every where spoken of as ordained by God himself?—See John iii. 16.—1 John iv. 10.—1 Pet. i. 18, 19, 20.—Rev. xiii. 8.—But still it is demanded, in 'what way can the death of Christ, considered as a sacrifice of expiation, be conceived to operate to the remission of sins, unless by the appeasing a Being, who otherwise would not have forgiven us?' To this the answer of the Christian is, 'I know not, nor does it concern me to know, *in what manner* the sacrifice of Christ is connected with the forgiveness of sins: it is enough, that this is declared by God to be the medium through which my salvation is effected. I pretend not to dive into the counsels of the Almighty. I submit to his wisdom; and I will not reject his grace, because his mode of vouchsafing it is not within my comprehension,'" &c, &c.

At the same time, he shews, by references to Dr. Clarke, Bishop Butler and others, that those great men did not hesitate to say, "that according to the method and dispensation which God's wisdom *has* chosen, there results a *moral necessity*, of such vindication, founded in the *wisdom* and *prudence* of a Being, who has announced himself to mankind, as an upright Governor, resolved to maintain the observance of his laws." Or, in other words, "that the death of Christ was *necessary*, to make the pardon of sin reconcileable, not, perhaps absolutely with *strict justice*, but it was *necessary*, at least in *this* respect, to make it consistent with the *wisdom* of God, in his good government of the world; and to be a *proper attestation* of his irreconcileable hatred against all unrighteousness."—See Dr. Magee's Discourses on Atonement and Sacrifice, vol i. pp. 23, and 178.

A MODERATE CALVINIST.

Mr. Wright, on an Error in his Journal.

Wisbeach, March 16, 1813.

Sir,

By a letter from a respected friend at Kendal, I find there is an error in the statement given in the Extracts from the Report of the Unitarian Fund, (Vol. vii. p. 773.) The name of the minister of the Unitarian Baptists at Kendal, is *Kay*, not *Cave*. Mr. Kay and his friends were never in Mr. Haldane's connexion, any further than they deemed it their "duty to receive as brethren all those who appeared to them to be holding and walking in the truth." Nor were any letters exchanged between Mr. Kay and Mr. Haldane on the change of sentiment, which took place among the friends at Kendal, as stated in the before mentioned extracts. I am anxious these mistakes should be corrected, by the insertion of this short article in the Repository.

As Mr. Kay conjectures, I was led into the error which I have pointed out, by respectable friends at Newcastle, from whom I understood the account just as I stated it: they too, as Mr. K. further conjectures, were led into the misconception by the relation given them by a worthy person from Kendal, through a misapplication of names.

Respectfully, Yours, &c.

RICHARD WRIGHT.

On a Passage in Mr. Wright's Journal.

Sir,

In your Number for February last, (p. 132, 133) Mr. Wright has stated, that among the Unitarians in Lancashire and Cheshire, "a change has taken place in the mode of preaching, and that the dry ethical method has given way to the preaching of Unitarianism as the doctrine of the gospel. "Christian discourses," he adds, "have been filled with the sentiments and language of the gospel. In this way, the best morality has been placed on the best foundation, evangelical righteousness on evangelical principles."

Formerly Sir, it was conceived, that nothing was more dry than theology, especially when it was interlarded with metaphysics, or presented in the form of texts detached from their connexion, for the sake of establishing particular dogmas. Certainly it is not the nature of ethical or moral preaching to be dry. The genius of the preacher may make it so, and would impart the same quality to any other subject. What can be less dry, or more interesting than the moral discourses of Bourn, Fawcett and Walker? If such writings as their's present not good models for Christian preaching, then the idea of the inconsiderate enemy to moral discourses might be adopted, that the sermon on the mount was not a Christian sermon.

If Mr. Wright mean, that Unitarian ministers in Lancashire and Cheshire have been accustomed to preach sermons on moral duties without enforcing them by Christian motives, or by reference to the instructions, character, and example of Jesus Christ, I must take the liberty of dissenting from him, and of concluding, that he has been misinformed. But on this subject, neither a negative, nor a positive can easily be proved, unless by reference to discourses before the public. Should Enfield's Sermons for the use of families, appear in some measure to fall under Mr. Wright's censure, (though surely, they cannot justly be called dry, and though the subject of one is the example of Jesus Christ,) ample amends have undoubtedly been made by many of his posthumous discourses, in which passages from the gospel are expounded and applied, and by the views which he has given on the different sentiments of Christians as relating to the person and offices of their master. In fact, no moral or religious topics are unsuitable to the Christian preacher, who in the course of long life and service may profitably treat both on natural and rational, on revealed and instituted religion, on the rule of life, or on the rule of faith, on the duties of man to himself, to his neighbour, and to his God, on the moral sense, and on theopathy, or the devout affections, and on the religious doctrines of the Holy Scriptures. Surely all and every one of these in their connexion and tendency, as recommended by the motives, sanctions and examples of the gospel, may justly be styled truly evangelical doctrine.

For relief to his mind at a season of unmerited trouble, Mr. Wood, of Leeds, published a small volume of sermons on the social duties, in which the word Christ may not occur so often as some might wish. Yet these are not less Christian duties, because that epithet is not always prefixed. But, whilst probably Mr. Wood's stated hearers could easily repel the charge, that his sermons in general did not contain "the sentiments and language of the gospel," or that he did *not* "place evangelical righteousness on evangelical principles," it is well known, that both Dr. Priestley and himself imagined religious controversy better fitted for the lecture-room or the press, than for the pulpit. How far they were right or wrong on this subject is not the question, but that on such occasions, as they thought proper, they *spoke out*, and never withheld or disguised the most ingenuous and plainest declaration of their theological sentiments cannot reasonly be denied.

When about the middle of the

18th century, Mr. J. Holland's sermons were published, they were stigmatized in the Monthly Review as moral essays, but if it be considered, that they were among the first productions of a youthful mind, smitten with the beauties of the Socratic moral philosophy, desirous to imbibe and transfuse its spirit, and to shew how it was still more refined and improved by Christian ethics, they may deservedly be ranked in the highest class of discourses recommending evangelical duties. These volumes too contain one sermon expressly on the example of Christ, in which the author has avowed his views to be those, which have since been deemed the essence of low Arianism. How far these views might have been changed, or what other modes of instruction the writer might have adopted, if he had been the pastor for any length of time in any particular congregation, or if he had lived beyond the prime of life, it is impossible to discover and unnecessary to imagine. Many of Mr. Philip Holland's sermons also are on moral subjects, but whilst none are closed without a view to Christianity, divine revelation and a future state, the doctrine, that Jesus was the Messiah, who rose from the dead, is expressly and particularly considered, the subject of the personality of the Holy Spirit is most impartially discussed and represented, and in the charge on the character of the Christian preacher, scarcely a topic relative to the authority and religion of the Scriptures is left untouched. If it be said, that these discourses are better fitted for the study than for the pulpit, for well-educated, philosophical and refined minds, than for the illiterate, they have at least, in subordination to the Bible furnished a source, whence those with more popular talents have drawn, or may draw, the waters of eternal life.

No one, however, who has perused the sermons published by Mr. Turner, of Wakefield, will hesitate to allow, that they are in every just sense as truly and strictly evangelical in style, manner and sentiment, as the posthumous discourses of his friend Mr. Lindsey.

On these grounds therefore, and from the consideration of other circumstances peculiar to myself, which have enabled me to hear more ministers preach, than some, who are constantly engaged in the same office themselves, I conclude Mr. Wright's charge not to be well-founded, or not to be generally applicable.

When Dr. Priestley first avowed himself to be what is now called a Unitarian, he did not know more than three or four of his ministerial brethren, who held the same sentiments. Of those, who were not decided Trinitarians, the greater part were Arians, whose congregations were of a mixed nature. The consequence was, that some of these joined Methodists of different descriptions, and others remained in those societies, which are now called Unitarian.

Whilst the ministers in the latter were themselves engaged in the laborious process of theological inquiry, and unwilling without full conviction to surrender the peculiar sentiments of their forefathers; instead of directly attacking the prejudices of their less informed people, they judged it a wiser plan to adhere to the un-controverted and incontrovertible principles of the gospel, as the surest basis of just, liberal and Christian opinion. Had they, as their own minds were opened and enlightened, declared every doctrine, or rather opposed every mysterious or superstitious one, before they could supply the proper evidence for others, or were themselves perhaps completely convinced, they might have driven many weaker, yet well disposed characters into the fastnesses of Trinitarian mystery. But by a more gradual, though surer method, by the process of calm, judicious, yet free, impartial and unbiassed inquiry, many congregations as well as ministers have been imperceptibly led to embrace those principles, which Mr. Wright recommends with characteristic good temper, with earnest apostolical zeal, with unaffected benevolence, and with truly Christian piety. His is undoubtedly the best mode for himself, and for those who embrace his views. That it will also do much good, and contribute to the spread of truth, I have not the smallest doubt. Nor do I blame, but rather praise, those ministers of ardent, independent minds, who scruple not in the most public manner to avail themselves of the talents which God has given them, to avow their sentiments in direct terms, and to oppose and confute the doctrines of mystery and superstition before the most crowded audiences: but others in different circumstances, and with inferior powers may do well to consider, whether it is not a better plan for them to proceed more gradually, to build the doctrines on the evidences of Christianity, and to make the whole a system of education for the young rather than subjects of public discussion, before the mind is always sufficiently prepared for their consideration. Hence it seems, as if those ministers, who preceded the present generation of Unitarians, had judiciously and effectually prepared the way for them. Perhaps then they might be justified in saying to their successors, Others have laboured, and ye have entered into their labours.

J. H.

Mr. Wright to Mr. Strephon.

Wisbeach, March 16, 1813.

SIR,

In yours to me, (page 31) you say, "Many of your readers would gladly see your reply to the following question; viz. If some members of a congregation have heard others deny the divine mission, miracles and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ; would the former, on seeing the latter come to his table, be guilty of a breach of christian charity in declining communion with them?"

This, Sir, is a case not likely to occur in any Dissenting congregation; where the road to worldly emolument, honour, or power, is not over the Lord's table, and secular interest is not advanced by partaking of his supper: yet I will not say it is an impossible case. Christian charity forbids our concluding such a case to exist without the most clear and cogent proof. Persons may entertain such views of the divine mission, miracles and resurrection of Jesus as others suppose amount to a denial of those great facts; but the persons themselves so far from perceiving this, may sincerely believe they receive them in the only light in which they are defensible. We may hear others express themselves in terms which seem to imply a denial of the divine mission &c. of Jesus; but if on farther enquiry we find it was not their intention, and they did not understand their words to express such a denial, we ought not to conclude against their christianity. Persons may have doubts, these they may express in strong terms, they may sometimes assume the ground taken by unbelievers, when conversing with those from whom they hope to receive a solution of their difficulties, and an increase of information; yet on the whole the evidence of the divine mission of Jesus &c. may preponderate with them. If possessed of common honesty, their coming to the Lord's table, when they have no worldly end to gain by doing it, is a stronger proof of their faith in Christ than words casually spoken are of their unbelief: nor ought it to be concluded they are influenced by corrupt motives unless we have full proof of it. But suppose the case to be real, have we a right to withdraw from the Lord's table because they are there? Ought we to expel them, if it be in our power? To the first of these questions, I reply; if we believe it our duty to attend the Lord's table, we ought not to neglect it merely because some may attend there hypocritically; if we esteem it a privilege, should we neglect it because some abuse it? The advice of Paul is, that each person should examine himself, not others. By appearing at the Lord's table we renew the expression of our faith in Christ, not our entire conviction of the faith of others. To the second, I reply; we can have no right authoritatively to exclude any from the Lord's table, for this clear reason, because *it is the Lord's.* Jesus is the only master, and has not delegated his authority to us. Religious hypocrisy is undoubtedly a great crime, and if unbelievers attend the Lord's table they are guilty of it; such cannot eat in faith, but are self-condemned. It can be no breach of christian charity to declare that we do not acknowledge such to be christian brethren; we must view them as *tares* among the *wheat;* but we know who hath said, Let both grow together till the harvest. It cannot be wrong, and I think duty requires it of us, to remonstrate with such persons, and use every means to convince them of the impropriety of their conduct. This is all we have a right to do, and this I think will be sufficient to deter them from coming to the Lord's table.

Respectfully Yours,

R. WRIGHT.

Addition to the List of Pupils under Mr. Aikin, while at Kibworth, p. 164.

Rev. *John Hall*, a native of Sheffield, and nephew to the Rev. Samuel Sanderson, of Bedford, who undertook the care of his education, and afterwards placed him under the tuition of Dr. Ashworth, at Daventry. Mr. Hall was for several years minister of a congregation at Stannington, near Sheffield, from whence he removed to the English church at Rotterdam, in Holland, where it is supposed he is yet living.—Cotemporary with him, though his senior, was the late Rev. *Thomas Robins*, who succeeded Dr. Ashworth in the congregation, and the academy at Daventry. A man of distinguished eminence as a christian, a preacher and a tutor. See a brief memoir of him by Mr. Watson, the present minister of Daventry. See also *Letters of the Rev. Job. Orton, to Dissenting ministers.* Vol. ii. p. 53—73.

S. P.

A Family Bible.

Sir,

I much approve the proposal of the Bible Christian, p. 178, but wish to suggest what I cannot but think an improvement of it. Which is, to correct the common translation, where it is agreed by all parties to be erroneous, or where the phraseology is obsolete, or indelicate, as I am sorry to say it is to such a degree in some places, that no modest person could read some verses to a family, and none could hear them without confusion of face.

R. S.

Extract from an old Scottish Confession of Faith.

Birmingham, Dec. 15, 1812.

Sir,

The enclosed (if you think proper to insert it in your Miscellany) may yield some entertainment, and perhaps instruction to your readers. At any rate it is much at your service, either to reprint or to burn it.

Yours, &c.
ROBERT LITTLE.

It may be new information to some, that the reformed church of Scotland has had several different confessions of faith. The one which is now subscribed by its ministers, is the most modern, and was the joint production of English and Scotch Commissioners, met at Westminster. But the Confession avowed by the Scotch church, previously to that time, was composed by John Knox and his coadjutors, and is remarkable for a greater degree of simplicity and purity of sentiment. It was drawn up in Latin, and an English translation is annexed to it, dated August 1560. We give the following extract, which is worthy the attentive perusal of the reader. It is—

" Sect. xviii. *Of the notis, be the quhilk the trewe Kirk is decernit fra the false, and quha sall be Judge of the doctrine.*—

" Because that Sathan from the beginning hes laboured to deck his pestilent Synagoge with the title of the Kirk of God, and hes inflamed the hertes of cruel murtherers, to persecute, trouble and molest the trewe Kirk and members thereof, as Cain did Abell, Ismael Isaac, Esau Jacob, and the haill Priesthead of the Jewes Christ Jesus himselfe, and his Apostles after him. It is ane thing maist requisite, that the true Kirk be decernit fra the filthie Synagoges, be clear and perfite notes, least we being deceived, receive and imbrace to our awin condemnatioun, the ane for the uther. The notes, signes and assured takens whereby the immaculate spouse of Christ Jesus is knawen fra the horrible harlot, the Kirk malignant, we affirme, are nouther antiquitie, title usurpit, lineal descence, place appointed, nor multitude of men approving ane error: for Caine in age and title was preferred to Abel and Seth: Jerusalem had prerogative above all places of the eird, where alswa were the priests lineally descended fra Aaron, and greater number followed the Scribes, Pharisies, and priestes, then unfainedly beleeved and approved Christ Jesus and his doctrine: and zit, as we suppose, no man of sound judgment will grant that ony of the forenamed were the Kirk of God. The notes therefore of the trew Kirk of God, we beleeve, confesse and avow to be, first, the trew preaching of the worde of God, into the quhilk God hes revealed himselfe unto us, as the writings of the prophets and apostles dois declair. Secondly, the right administration of the Sacraments of Christ Jesus, quhilk man be annexed unto the word and promise of God, to seale and confirme the same in our hearts. Last, ecclesiastical discipline uprightlie ministred, as Goddis worde prescribes, whereby vice is repressed, and vertew nurished. Wheresoever then thir former notes are seene, and of ony time continue (be the number never so fewe, about two or three) there, without all doubt, is the trew Kirk of Christ: who, according unto his promise, is in the middis of them. Not that universall, of quhilk we have before spoken bot particular, sik as wes in Corinthus, Galatia, Ephesus and uther places, in quhilk the ministry was planted by Paull, and were of himselfe named the kirks of God: and sik kirks we the inhabitantis of the realme of Scotland, professoris of Christ Jesus, professis ourselfis to have in our citties, townes and places reformed, for the doctrine taucht in our kirkis, conteined in the written worde of God, to wit in the buiks of the Auld and New Testamentis, in those buikis we meane, quhilk of the ancient have been reputed canonicall. In the quhilk we affirme, that all thingis necessary to be beleeved for the salvation of mankinde, is sufficiently expressed. The interpretation quhairof, we confesse, neither appertaines to private nor publick persone, neither zit to ony Kirk, for ony preheminence or prerogative, personallie or locallie, quhilk ane hes above ane uther, bot apperteines to the Spirite of God, be the quhilk also the Scripture was written. When controversie then happines, for the right understanding of ony place or sentence of Scripture, or for the reformation of ony abuse within the Kirk of God, we ought not sa meikle to luke what men before us have said or done, as unto that quhilk the Halie Ghaist uniformelie speakes within the body of the Scriptures, and unto that quhilk Christ Jesus himself did, and commanded to be done. For this is ane thing universally granted, that the Spirite of God, quhilk is the Spirite of unitie, is in nathing contrarious unto himself. Gif then the interpretation, determination, or sentence of ony Doctor, Kirk, or Councell, repugne to the plaine word of God, written in ony uther place of the Scripture, it is a thing maist certaine, that there is not the true understanding and meaning of the Haly Ghaist, although that councels, realmes, and nations, have approved and received the same. For we dare not receive or admit ony interpretation quhilk repugnes to ony principal part of our faith, or to ony uther plaine text of Scripture, or zit unto the rule of charitie.*"

Quaker Doctrine of the Trinity.

London, 9th of 3*rd mo.* 1813.

I was surprised to find in the last number of thy publication, a paper which professes to give, from good authority, the belief of the Society of Friends, on the subject of what is called the Trinity. I hope thou wilt give me an early opportunity of correcting any wrong impression, which this article may have made upon the minds of thy readers, by informing them, that the Trinity, so called, was never acknowledged in any manner whatever, by our Society; *and that the very term even is disallowed by our body, as being no where to be found in the Holy Scriptures.* I should have supposed, from the tenour of the communication, that thy correspondent, N. C., was better acquainted with the history of our Society, than to suppose that we subscribed to any creed whatever, except the Bible can be termed a creed. I have been a member of this Society many years, and I confess, I never saw or heard of a Quaker Creed; and, doubtless had there been one, it would have been promulgated by the founder of our Society, or by some of his contemporaries. A creed, in the strict sense of the word, we cannot have; it would subvert the corner stone of our religious profession; for seeing that we regard the Scriptures themselves as a *secondary*, not a primary rule of faith, how could we subscribe to a particular formula of doctrine, agreed upon by a certain number of individuals? We venerate the scriptures; we regard them as the choicest gift of God to man; but we hold, that they cannot be rightly understood, unless we are assisted by a portion of that spirit which dictated them to the inspired writers. Every individual, therefore, is left to the *free, unbiassed* interpretation of the scriptures, as made known to him by that light, or grace, with which he has been favoured, and which will be in proportion to his humble reliance upon divine aid. Thus we maintain, that the most learned commentaries are of no avail, and that the unlettered believer, if he come to the perusal of the holy writings with a pure and upright intention, may obtain a more perfect comprehension of the will of God, than the most erudite collegian, who relies upon his knowledge of the dead languages.* It must, therefore, be evident that the Society of Friends have no creed, in the popular sense of the word; and as we maintain, that no human assistance or skill can unfold the truths of Revelation, as recorded in the scriptures, thy correspondent must be in an error, when he asserts, *that a member of our Society has been expelled for questioning the doctrine of the Trinity.* The Society, *as a body,* never pretended to interpret the scriptures, and as for the Trinity, they do not admit even the term, as being no were to found in the scriptures. Thy correspondent, N. C., should be careful of using any expression, especially in print, that may mislead the serious enquirer after Christian truth.

---

* See Coll. of Conf. of Faith, &c. vol. ii, p. 65. Edit. 1722.

I am thy Friend,

A. B.

Mr. Flower's Strictures on Mr, Belsham's Account of Robert Robinson, in his Memoirs of Theophilus Lindsey.

Harlow, Feb. 4, 1813.

Sir,

Having in my letter inserted in your last, (p. 17) vindicated the integrity of Mr. Robinson, I trust, to the satisfaction of your readers, from the attack of Mr. Belsham, I proceed to notice some other passages in the work I have quoted, respecting his opinions and those of his friends and admirers. In a letter to a friend, Mr. R. as we have seen, assigned the following reason, amongst others, for declining to answer Mr. Lindsey's *Examination* of the *Plea.*—"His faith stands on criticisms; and my argument is, that if the doctrine require critical proof it is not popular, and therefore not divine:" on which the learned biographer remarks as follows:—

---

* For I have known some of my friends, who profess the same faith with me, faithful servants of the Most High God, and full of divine knowledge of his truth, as it was inwardly and immediately revealed to them by the Spirit, from a true and living experience, who not only were ignorant of the Greek and Hebrew, but even some of them could not even read their own vulgar language, who being pressed by their adversaries, with some citations out of the English translation, and finding them to disagree with the manifestation of truth, in their own hearts, have boldly affirmed the Spirit of God never said so, and that it was certainly wrong; for they did not believe that any of the holy prophets or apostles had ever written so, which, when I on this account, seriously examined, I really found to be errors and corruptions of the translators.—*Barclay's Apology,* 4to ed. p. 61.

"It is said to have been a favourite maxim of this extraordinary man at one time of his life—*Criticism is a good thing in its place, but woe to the system which depends upon it.* And from this it has been weakly inferred by some of Mr. Robinson's admirers, whose zeal exceeded their knowledge, that a doctrine supported by criticism *must* be erroneous, *because*, forsooth, the common people could not understand it. These wise men, it seems, are not aware that the main object of scripture criticism is, to discover the sense which would be most obvious to those for whose immediate use the scriptures were written, which must, no doubt, be the true sense, however contrary to modern ideas and prejudices. That Mr. R. was not serious in this sarcastic reflection upon criticism, or that he afterwards thought more rationally on the subject, is evident from a letter to a friend," an extract from which, given by Mr. B. is too long for quotation; the substance is a commendation of "sober, just criticism," and a reproof to those who, although excessively dogmatical and censorious, in their explanation of the phraseology of scripture, "never knew what criticism was."

Here I beg leave to remark, that if Mr. B. instead of drawing his inferences against a supposed opinion of Mr. Robinson's, and holding up his admirers to ridicule, on a mere report—"It is said," the invention probably of some *John O'Nokes* or *Tom O'Styles*, had examined what Mr. Robinson himself had written on the subject, he might have spared himself the trouble of writing the above paragraph. Indeed, Mr. R. on so many occasions, fully explained himself on this topic, that had even the superficial reader of his works not understood him, it might have excited some surprise. It was a favourite opinion of Mr. Robinson's, and which forms one of the grand features of his writings, that the gospel being preached by our Saviour to the poor, and consequently designed (in contradistinction to all the systems of heathen philosophy) for the use of the very lowest classes of the people in all ages and countries, these classes were in all matters essential to salvation, proper judges of its meaning; and although learning and critical skill were useful in their proper places, that a poor man possessing neither, might attain to a competent knowledge of the most important truths of revelation. Had Mr. B. recollected what Mr. R. had asserted on this very point, in the work on which he was animadverting, he would have perceived that the author had adopted that just canon of criticism, which, in this instance, is laid down by Mr. B. and which Mr. R. had quoted from the Bishop of Carlisle. (Dr. Law). "There can be no better canon of interpretation," says Mr. R., "than that which an amiable prelate has given us:—*scripture is to be taken in that sense in which the common people took it.*" This subject is so frequently illustrated and enforced in Mr. Robinson's writings, that I am under some difficulty, from which to select in the volumes now before me. I will, however, confine myself to the *Plea*, in which the author expresses his opinions in language equally just and beautiful.

"We do not think it necessary

to enter on learned arguments. A doctrine supported only by criticisms, the understanding of which requires much literary skill, is certainly a doctrine not intended for the bulk of mankind. All truths which fall under the notice of both the learned and unlearned part of mankind, are subject to learned objections, and to popular objections, and consequently they are to be defended by learned and by popular arguments. A plain Christian ought to propose his doubts, if he have any, about the truth of a doctrine; but when his own own doubts are removed by the force of plain, popular reasoning, he ought not to suffer his mind to be bewildered in Greek and Hebrew characters, the reasonings on which he does not understand. It is the glory of all the doctrines of Christianity, and particularly that of Christ's divinity, to give evidence to common observation, and to plain good sense."

In another part of the same work, replying to objectors, he observes as follows:—"Says a third, you cannot be so ignorant as you pretend to be. You have read the great Dr. Clarke. Have you never seen those critical dissections of texts by learned men, which explain all the passages that seem to support your nostrum, and prove that they are all on the opposite side. He [the plain Christian] would beg leave to reply:—I have read Dr. Clarke, and a hundred doctors more; and I have read, also, a saying of one, who, although he was no graduate, was greater than them all. He says:—*Call no man master upon earth, for one is your master, even Christ.* Yes, I have seen many a critical anatomist dissect a text; but while he instructed me in occult science, he destroyed that general pleasing effect the Creator had produced by the whole. You can never persuade me, that an article so important as the doctrine of the *object* of our worship is allowed to be, lies concealed in depths of erudition. The belief of Christ's divinity is an effect, I think, produced by the features of the face of revelation, if you will pardon the expression. I have all the veneration for Dr. Clarke, that I ought to have, but, in my opinion, I could make more converts to the being of a God, with an oyster and a nettle, than he could with all his mathematical propositions. Mathematics and criticisms may confirm a wise man in religion, but woe be to the religion that hangs upon them."*

These opinions on the nature and use of criticism, were uniformly maintained by the author, nor has Mr. Belsham produced evidence which has a tendency to prove he was, in any degree, inconsistent on this head. As to those "wise men, whose zeal exceeded their knowledge," and who "weakly inferred that a doctrine supported by criticism *must* be erroneous, *because*, forsooth, the common people could not understand it," Mr. Belsham's "*zeal* has," I fear, "exceeded *his* knowledge," in holding up such idiots to the world as Mr. Robinson's admirers. "*It is said*," (and this is the only answer, which insinuations so unworthy the Christian, or the man of learning or liberality deserve:—) "*It is said*" that these "wise men" of *Gotham* never had an existence but in Mr. Belsham's imagination.

---

* Plea for the Divinity of Christ, 4th ed. p. 9, 10, 163. Or Miscel. Works, vol. iii. p. 9, 104.

But, Mr. Robinson, as Mr. B. has told his readers, although convinced of his error, refusing, contrary to his promise, to retract it on conviction, and despising criticism, "soon recovered the tenor of his mind; and *wisely profiting by rebuke*," (it is to be hoped his example will not be lost sight of even by the *learned)* "he paid greater attention to the important question, not disdaining to call in the aid of sober and just criticism, and in a short time reformed his opinion, and became decidedly Anti-trinitarian. This is a known fact. I shall mention but one proof of it. In a letter to a friend dated March 4, 1789, speaking of an aged minister who had applied for relief to the Baptist board, he says;—'Instead of sending him charity they sent him faith, and informed him that they had made a law not to relieve any except they subscribed a creed, a human creed, which they sent him; and the first article of which is:—There are three divine persons in the unity of the Godhead! Absolute nonsense! supported by tyranny over men's consciences."

The first thing I request the reader here to notice, is the *date* of the letter quoted. Mr. B. represents Mr. Robinson's conversion as taking place "a short time after he was suffering the rebukes of conscience," "stung to the quick," "convinced of his error," "resolved, however," contrary to his promise, "to keep a prudent silence:" but this "short time," appears to have been four years afterwards, about fifteen months before his death; but what is somewhat surprising, the letter quoted in proof of this "known fact," affords not a particle of evidence of any "reformation," or even alteration of opinion; this indeed must be plain to every attentive reader of Mr. Belsham's account; for he informs us in the second page from that which contains the above quotation, that "the Plea for the Divinity of Christ, is framed more upon the Sabellian than the high Arian scheme, and that he" (Mr. R.) "tells Dr. Jebb, in a letter written at the time of its first publication,—'It is not impossible, that our sentiments, much as they seem to differ, may, after all, differ less than they appear to do.'" In a letter, written by Dr. Priestley, to Mr. Lindsey, shortly after the death of Mr. Robinson, inserted in the "Appendix to the Memoirs," the Doctor, after hinting that Mr. R. at the time he wrote the *Plea*, held what is called the "indwelling scheme," adds,—"he said in my hearing, he always thought the doctrine of the Trinity an absurdity." Now, although I apprehend Dr. Priestley was not quite correct in his report of what Mr. R. said, as the latter was certainly a Trinitarian, judging by his confession of faith, at his ordination, yet if instead of "always," we substitute the words *for many years*, this will appear to be the fact; and if we consider the mistakes to which Dr. Priestley was occasionally subject, but which I firmly believe were sincere, *that* alluded to appears comparatively trivial.

From the evidence, however, thus adduced by Mr. Belsham, the conclusion naturally follows, that the change recorded with so much triumph, happens to be—no change at all!

If any doubt remain on this subject, I could produce abundant evidence, from my own conversation with Mr Robinson, and from his "Miscellaneous Works," that he was not a Trinitarian in the common acceptation of the word, at the period when he wrote his *Plea*, and when the work and its author were in the meridian of their popularity; but as I have adduced this evidence on another occasion,* I shall not here repeat it: there is, however, an excellent discourse of Mr. Robinson's, just published in a volume of his "Posthumous Works," on "The Corruptions of Christianity," so conclusive on this point, that I must beg leave to transcribe an extract, and which will probably be new to the majority of your readers. The discourse was preached to the author's congregation, at Cambridge, in the year 1780, when the fourth edition of the *Plea* had been just published, and, let it be recollected, five years before Mr. Lindsey published his *Examination*; that *Examination* which converted Mr. Robinson from a Trinitarian to an Anti-trinitarian!

"In the first place, the church of Rome introduced into Christianity the idea of *plurality*, and joined it to the idea of *Deity*. What I mean is this:—Christ taught the apostles that there was ONE GOD, and but ONE, and *one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus*: the apostles kept on teaching this till they died, and they preserved, with all imaginable care, the Unity of God; —and with a great deal of reason. One God was enough for any worshipper; and to add ten thousand would be nothing but idolatry. But what did the Church of Rome do? It threw into the idea of *Deity*, (Deity signifies Godhead) *plurality*, which is more than one. It was a saying, my brethren, of the apostle Paul, and it was the faith of the primitive Christian church, to *others*, to the gentiles, there are *Gods many and Lords many, but to us*, that is to *us* Christians, *there is* but *one God, the Father, and one Lord, Jesus Christ*. But now, it may be said, to *Papists* there are *Gods many, and Lords many*, just as there is in the pagan world, but to *us* Protestants, there is—Ah! have not I said too much—there ought to be but *one God, and one Mediator and Lord, Christ Jesus*. You will ask me perhaps, how Protestants came by this? I will tell you what I think, my brethren. The common *popular* notion about a *Trinity*, is a relick of the old Popish idolatry, and the too prevailing gross ideas about the *Father, Son*, and *Spirit*, the dividing the Deity into *persons*, the naming of buildings and churches, in consequence of such notions, is a species of the same defilement.*"

To sum up the evidence on this point. It is clear that in the year 1780, when Mr. Robinson published the fourth edition of his "Plea," he was an Anti-trinitarian. Five years afterwards, Mr. Lindsey published his *Examination*, on reading which, we are gravely told, Mr. R. was "stung to the quick, under the rebukes of his conscience," and convinced of his error; which, however, in violation of his promise, he refused to retract "resolving to keep a prudent silence;" but that "in a short time," that is, four years afterwards—"*it is a known fact*, he recovered the tenor of his mind, reformed his opinion and became" —what would you suppose, reader? Why truly "he became" what he was ten years before, "decidedly Anti-trinitarian"!!! So much for this wonderful and much vaunted conversion.

---

* Memoirs prefixed to vol. i. of Robinson's Miscellaneous Works.

* Posthumous Works, p. 59—61.

"It is not quite clear," adds the learned biographer, "to what distance from the standard of orthodoxy this ingenuous and inquisitive man carried his speculations upon the subject of the person of Christ." To this opinion I cordially assent; and this being the fact, what a pity is it, that the different parties who have been so eager to discover the precise "distance," and have written as dogmatically as if they had made the complete discovery, did not leave the point to be settled by the person most interested, and by an appeal to his writings. If, instead of branding him with party names, and throwing out insinuations which tend materially to injure his character;—if, instead of wasting their time in fruitless inquiries, they had attended to his invaluable writings, which contain such a treasure of instruction and entertainment, so much rational, scriptural and practical piety, and recommended them to others, leaving unsettled what the author had not explained, to the gratification of their curiosity, or to the extent of their wishes, they would have acted quite as wise a part, and have been employed much more profitably.

But Mr. Belsham, after bewildering himself in so many mazes, was not content with having fortunately discovered the right road. He must seek for farther evidence to enable him to find out the precise "distance" Mr. R. had departed from the popular faith; but, after all, he leaves the matter as uncertain as he found it. We are referred to the last week of Mr. Robinson's life, when on a visit at Birmingham, and when it is acknowledged his bodily health and his mental powers were so impaired that little stress is to be laid on what proceeded from (as he so affectingly termed himself,) "the shadow of Robert Robinson." Dr. Priestley's Sermon on his death, is quoted as follows: "What most of all distinguished Mr. Robinson, was his earnest love of truth, and his laborious search after it. Notwithstanding his long attachment to the doctrine of the Trinity, yet continuing to read and think on the subject, he came at length to change his opinion, and before he died, he was one of the most zealous Unitarians." When the Dr. made these hasty assertions he had no idea, that he should in less than a fortnight afterwards, state, that "he *always* thought the doctrine of the Trinity an absurdity."—When it is added, "he became one of the most zealous Unitarians," in the sense understood by Dr. Priestley and Mr. B. I affirm there is no evidence to prove such assertion. The Doctor "expressing his delight in Mr. Robinson's conversation, and his disappointment in his preaching," says, "his discourse was unconnected and desultory, and his manner of treating the Trinity savoured rather of burlesque than serious reasoning." The latter statement appears to be just; for, as I was informed by an Unitarian acquaintance who heard the sermon, Mr. Robinson when alluding to the vulgar doctrine, said: — "There are many who believe in three persons in the Deity, or three Gods. Now we are informed in scripture, that the ONE GOD *fills heaven and earth;* where then can they find room for the other *two?*" I have nothing to say in defence of this feeble effusion of an almost worn out, but once most vigorous mind; but it must, I think, strike the reader, that the opinion meant to be conveyed, in no degree varies from that inculcated in the discourse I have quoted, preached at a time when his faculties were in their prime, and when he was in the habit of receiving the flatteries even of the *orthodox.*

Mr. Belsham has, however, "no doubt" that Mr. Robinson was, at the close of his life a "decided Unitarian, in the sense in which Dr. Priestley always used the word, that is, as a believer in the proper humanity of Christ." I could, however, assign various reasons, why I am obliged to "doubt" the correctness of this statement; but as I fear I have already intruded on the patience of your readers, I must be content with assigning one just quoted, from Mr. B. and which I must beg leave to re-quote, by which it appears he entertained a similar "doubt" himself, although it was so speedily exchanged for full assurance.—"It is *not quite clear* to what distance from the standard of orthodoxy this ingenuous and inquisitive man carried his speculations upon the subject of the person of Christ." Mr. B. however, presently adds,—"It is said that Mr. R. had avowed Unitarian principles in conversation, before his constitution was impaired;" to which it is quite sufficient to reply—*It is said* he had *not.*

Mr. Belsham has, in various parts of Mr. Lindsey's Memoirs, volunteered as the exposer and corrector of the mistakes of Dr. Priestley, most of which would probably have been soon lost sight of, in the general excellence of his character, had they not been thus revived and recorded by his *friend.* It is, however, rather unfortunate, that in correcting the mistakes of the Doctor, he was not more cautious of committing mistakes of almost equal magnitude himself. "It is certain," says Mr. B. "that Dr. Priestley must have been misinformed, when told by one of Mr. R.'s congregation," a year before the death of his pastor, "that they became almost universally Unitarians." How any one could make such an egregious blunder it is difficult to say, and useless to inquire; and as Mr. B. himself gave it no credit, why record and thus perpetuate what had been much better forgotten: but, the biographer adds,—"many of the congregation had become decided Unitarians, though many, and, *perhaps,* the majority, thought differently." I hope I shall not be thought too presuming when, in consequence of a ten years residence at Cambridge, and having been well acquainted with the church, of which I was a member, as well as with the congregation in general, I think myself almost as well qualified to judge on this point as Mr. B. and I do firmly believe that the number of Unitarians, (I use the word in the same sense as Mr. B.) did not, at any period of Mr. R.'s life, nor at his death, amount, in a congregation of four or five hundred people, to half-a-dozen; and I farther declare my belief as firmly, that there was not an individual who ever thought his own peculiar sentiments on this subject, of sufficent consequence to attempt disturbing the church or congregation, or to induce him to separate from them. The statement of one undoubted fact will afford complete demonstration of the correctness of my assertions. Shortly after Mr. Robinson's death, the church and congregation gave a *unanimous* invitation to the Rev. Robert Hall, of Bristol, to the pastoral office; a gentleman who, although differing in *some* respects from his predecessor, in his doctrinal sentiments, and his sentiments on the subjects of civil and religious liberty, was as similar as could be expected in a thinking man who judged for himself, instead of being shackled by a creed. Those who were in the habit of hearing Mr. Hall, and who were confidentially conversant with him, will agree with me in the declaration, that although he was a believer in the Divinity of Christ, which he too explained differently from the great majority of those who hold the popular doctrine, he was not *at that time* a Trinitarian. He agreed with his predecessor in rejecting the doctrine of *three persons*, and that of the personality of the Holy Spirit. His Christian candour was likewise, in many respects similar. I have heard from his pulpit, respectable ministers of Arian and Socinian sentiments, and have frequently witnessed his testimony to the great abilities and moral worth of Dr. Priestley, declaring, "if the Doctor ever visited Cambridge, he should be welcome to his pulpit." His admirable publication—*Remarks on a Sermon of the Rev. John Clayton, sen.* in which that gentleman had reviled the character of the Doctor, and of the Dissenters in general for their endeavours to obtain the repeal of the intolerant and profane *Test* and *Corporation* Acts; expressing his wish, that "what was at rest might not be disturbed:" —and his equally admirable *Apology for the Freedom of the Press, and for General Liberty*, prove, likewise, that he, *at that time*, entered into the spirit of his predecessor's grand and noble sentiments on those subjects.*

Mr. Belsham has thought proper to add:—"This mixture of jarring and inconsistent opinions in a religious society is always to be expected, where the eloquence of the speaker and not the truth of principles is the bond of union." What a reflection on a Christian Society which had been chiefly raised by Mr. R. from the lowest to a most flourishing state, the members of which had for so many years, sat under his—not merely eloquent, but rational, scriptural and practical instructions, enforced by his life, his writings and "his labours of love," in the surrounding villages! — a reflection as groundless as uncandid, and as unwarrantable as some I have noticed, cast upon their pastor. Their "bond of union" was not "the eloquence of the preacher," so much as "the truth of his principles," of principles the most important, because they were the most practical. Although there might be differences of opinion on certain controverted points, as there will be in a greater or less degree in every Christian society under heaven, where the number is considerable, and their minds are not in a stagnant state, there was no "jarring;" and I earnestly hope that all societies in similar circumstances, will act with similar Christian prudence, and that no individuals will be found pestering the great majority with their own peculiar opinions, careless of the risk of distracting a flourishing interest. Mr. Belsham, in this reflection, has afforded too evident proof, that he can, at times, take the same liberties with the religious character of communities, as with that of individuals.

---

* Some of Mr. Hall's friends may think it injustice to hold up his former sentiments, without mentioning the revolution that has taken place in his mind, since he left Cambridge. He is now an *orthodox* Trinitarian, and a warm opponent of *heresy*; and if an article in the *Eclectic Review*, exposed in a late *Monthly Repository*, be, as currently reported, Mr. Hall's (and if it be not, it ought, in justice to his character, to be contradicted), he has displayed the zeal of a new convert with a witness! The revolution in the Rev. gentleman's political sentiments has sufficiently appeared in some of his printed sermons.

I have thus, Sir, endeavoured, I trust not unsuccessfully, to defend the character of Mr. Robinson, of his congregation, and of his *real* friends and admirers, from the attacks of Mr. Belsham. The task, I assure you, considering attendant circumstances, has not been a very pleasant one. The party which arrogates to itself the appellation of *orthodox*, such writers as the Rev. Messrs. Andrew Fuller, Bogue and Bennett, not forgetting the Rev. Dr. Rippon, with others of a similar stamp, had, in a way which reflects no great credit, on either their understandings or their hearts, endeavoured, by misrepresentations the most gross, to stab the reputation and to prevent the usefulness of a man, whose variegated excellencies they must be sensible, (I trust they have still so much modesty left,) are far above *their* reach. Indignant as I have always been at the conduct of men, who from his flatterers became his revilers, *that* indignation has been succeeded by horror, on reading, in a letter of Dr. Priestley's, the most affecting exclamation, proceeding from the bursting heart of a Christian minister of keen sensibility, reflecting on the cruel treatment he had received from those who had long enjoyed his valuable but undeserved friendship;—"They have killed me."* Treatment, not only something different, but directly opposite, might naturally have been expected from a gentleman of considerable talents, of great learning, the enlightened philosopher, and the liberal-minded Christian; but, unfortunately, Mr. Robinson's character has been stabbed by two opposite parties, who, although they can agree in nothing else, one might be almost led to imagine had formed a coalition on this occasion; and when I reflect how some others have been treated; their reputation attacked, and their weak sides most unnecessarily exposed, by a *friend*, I am ready to adopt the exclamation—"Heaven defend me from my *friends*, and I'll defend myself from my *enemies!*"

My regret has been increased, when reflecting that the work on a part of which I have deemed it my incumbent duty to animadvert, is The LIFE of THEOPHILUS LINDSEY. No testimony of mine, I am conscious, can add to the high reputation of such a man; but will you, Sir and your readers pardon what I fear will be termed vanity, but which is, indeed an effusion of gratitude due to his memory. When I reflect on the manner in which he first offered me his acquaintance and friendship, the eagerness he uniformly displayed in supporting my feeble efforts in the cause of civil and religious liberty, the confidential intercourses, sometimes on topics on which we differed, which intercourses, considering the vast inferiority on one side afforded such an instance of deep humility on the other, setting off and finishing (if I may so express myself) all his other Christian graces;—the benevolence I frequently witnessed, unconfined to sect or party; the numerous letters expressive of his esteem; the friendship, warm and sincere with which he and his excellent partner honoured me, and the late dearest possessor of my heart:—reflecting on these circumstances, my regret is increased when I find the "Memoirs" of such a man, containing matter extraneous and offensive, which may prevent a circulation so extensive and effects so beneficial as might otherwise have been naturally expected. Would the learned biographer abridge a work, which contains much treasure, he would, indeed, render a most essential service to the Christian world.—But I must stop my pen. May my soul rest with the soul of Theophilus Lindsey, in that world where I hope to be re-united with those I have esteemed and loved:—in that world where thorny controversy will never be permitted to enter, and "painful farewells and adieus shall be for ever unknown!"

---

* Memoirs of Lindsey, p. 529.

Your constant reader,
B. FLOWER.

Erratum in the last Number.—In the letter of Archdeacon Blackburne, p. 23, line 11, after the word "exceed," add—the charity of.

REVIEW.

Still pleas'd to praise, yet not afraid to blame.——POPE.

ART. I. *The Excellency of the Liturgy, in Four Discourses, preached before the University of Cambridge, in November, 1811. To which is prefixed an Answer to Dr. Marsh's Inquiry, respecting "the neglecting to give the Prayer-Book with the Bible." By the Rev. Charles Simeon, M. A. Fellow of King's College Cambridge.* 8vo. pp. 172. 6s. Cambridge, Deighton; London, Cadell and Davies. 1812.

Dr. Marsh has set a bad example in crowding his printed pages on the subject of the Bible Society with so many capitals: he, however, knows when to appear big, and when to content himself in an ordinary size; but his numerous opponents have not all aspired with equal judgment to the greatness conferred by the printer; some of them, and amongst them Mr. Simeon, quite confound the reader with their numerous and striking appeals to his eye. This is perhaps *typical* of the Bible-controversy: as the black letters towering from their ranks divert attention from the author to the printer, so bishops and archbishops, prime-ministers and princes, and the Church of England, are made to figure away in publications pro and con, in order to draw off notice from the real subject in dispute, which is nothing less than the Protestant and Protestant Dissenting principle of the sufficiency of scripture and right of private judgment.

Mr. Simeon contradicts, rather than confutes Dr. Marsh: he quotes largely from himself, and expatiates upon his own sentiments, and his own conduct, and his own reputation, which may, for aught we know, be of weight in the discussion, as far as it is local to Cambridge, but which we must venture to say, appear to us, remote as we are from that learned place, and unconnected with the great men who agitate it by their controversies, of very little moment. It would, for instance, be of no consequence on our pages, that Mr. Simeon himself was once a member of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, that he withdrew his name, that he wished to renew his subscription, but found it doubtful whether he should be re-admitted, that he recommended his brother to become a member, and that if Dr. Marsh will propose him, he will himself be again a candidate for admission. (pp. 51, 52.)

On the Liturgy of his church, Mr. Simeon is profuse in praises, the justness of which we cannot wholly deny. His extracts are passages which have been always admired; which were admired in the Mass-Book before they were translated into Protestantism and English: a Roman Catholic might produce them as *excellencies* in his own *Liturgy*, but this would be no proof that his worship was scriptural, or his church Christian.

Mr. Simeon is sparing in his notice of objections to the Liturgy; but he vindicates, though feebly, the expressions in the forms of baptism and burial, which have been stumbling-blocks to Dissenters. He also considers the damnatory clauses in the Athanasian Creed, and, upon the whole, defends them. But the writer that has the courage to do this ought to be heard for himself.

"As I have been speaking strongly of the moderation and candour of the liturgy, I will here bring forward the only exception to it that I am aware of; and that is found in the Athanasian Creed. The damnatory clauses contained in that creed, do certainly breathe a very different spirit from that which pervades every other part of our Liturgy. As to the doctrine of the Creed, it is perfectly sound, and such as ought to be universally received. But it is matter of regret that any should be led to pronounce a sentence of damnation against their fellow creatures, in any case where God himself has not clearly and certainly pronounced it. Yet, whilst I say this, permit me to add, that I think this Creed does not express, nor ever was intended to express, so much as is generally supposed. The part principally objected to, is, that whole statement, which is contained between the first assertion of the doctrine of the Trinity, and the other articles of our faith, and the objection is, that the damnatory clauses, which would be justifiable if confined to the general assertion respecting the doctrine of the Trinity, become unjustifiable, when extended to the whole of that which is annexed to it. But if we suppose that this intermediate part was intended as an *explanation* of the doctrine in question, we still, I think, ought not to be understood as affirming respecting that explanation, all that we affirm respecting the doctrine itself. If any one will read the Athanasian Creed with attention, he will find three damnatory clauses; one at the beginning, which is confined to the general doctrine of the Trinity; another at the close of what, for argument sake, we call the explanation of that doctrine; and another at the end, relating to the other articles of the Creed, such as the incarnation, death and resurrection of Christ, and his coming at the last day to judge the world. Now, whoever will compare the three clauses, will find a marked difference between them: those which relate to the general doctrine of the Trinity, and to the other articles of the Creed, are strong, asserting positively that the points must be *believed*, and that too *on pain of everlasting damnation:* but that which is annexed to the *explanation* of the doctrine, asserts only, that a man who is in earnest about his salvation *ought* to *think* thus of the Trinity. The words in the original are, 'Qui *vult* ergo salvus esse, *ita* de Trinitate *sentiat*:' and this shews in what sense we are to understand the more ambiguous language of our translation:—"He therefore that *will* be saved (i. e. is *willing* or desirous to be saved,) *must* thus think (let him thus think) of the Trinity." Thus it appears that the things contained in the beginning and end of the creed are spoken of as matters of *faith*; but this which is inserted in the midst, as a matter of *opinion* only: in reference to the first and last parts, the certainty of damnation is asserted; but in reference to the intermediate part nothing is asserted, except that such are the views which we *ought* to entertain of the point in question. Now I would ask, was this difference the effect of chance? or rather, was it not actually intended, in order to guard against the very objection that is here adduced?

"This then is the answer which we give on the supposition that the part, which appears so objectionable, is to be considered as an *explanation* of the doctrine in question. But what if it was never intended as an *explanation*? What if it contains only a *proof* of that doctrine, and an appeal to our reason that that doctrine is true? Yet, if we examine the creed, we shall find this to be the real fact. Let us, in a few words, point out the steps of the argument.

"The Creed says, 'The Catholic faith is this: that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance:' and then it proceeds, 'For there is one person of the father,' and so on; and then, after *proving* the distinct personality of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and their unity in the Godhead, it adds, "So THAT in all things, as is aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity, is to be worshipped. HE THEREFORE that will be saved, must thus think of the Trinity." Here are all the distinct parts of an argument. The position affirmed—the proofs adduced—the deduction made—and the conclusion drawn in reference to the importance of receiving and acknowledging that doctrine.

"From hence then I infer, that the damnatory clauses should be understood only in reference to the doctrine affirmed and not be extended to the parts which are adduced only in confirmation of it: and, if we believe that the doctrine of the Trinity is a fundamental article of the Christian faith, we may, without any breach of charity, apply to that doctrine what our Lord spake of the gospel at large, 'He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.'

"Thus, in either view, the use of the Creed may be vindicated: for if we consider the obnoxious part as *an explanation*, the terms requiring it to be received are intentionally softened; and if we consider it as *a proof*, it is to the doctrine proved, and not to the proof annexed, that the damnatory clauses are fairly applicable.

"Still, after all, I confess, that if the same candour and moderation that are observable in all other parts of the Liturgy, had been preserved here, it would have been better. For though I do verily believe, that those who deny the doctrine of the Trinity are in a fatal error, and will find themselves so at the day of judgment, I would rather deplore the curse that awaits them, than denounce it; and rather weep over them in my secret chamber, than utter anathemas against them in the house of God." (pp. 72—77.)

This commentary is worthy of the text; it is nearly as unintelligible, and only not quite so uncharitable as the Athanasian Creed. But we are pleased that even Mr. Simeon, though he must use, and thinks it expedient to defend, this piece of absurdity and anti-christianism, allows himself to wish that it were altered for the better: when such thorough-going churchmen, as his writings shew him to be, scruple to swallow, or receive with uneasiness, this spurious formulary, we may hope that the time is not far distant when no Christian people will be compelled by Act of Parliament to take into their mouths so nauseous and deleterious a compound.

Art. II. *The duty of Britons to promote, by safe, gradual and efficacious Means, the progress of Christianity and Civilization in India. A Sermon preached at the Meeting-House, Carter Lane, on Sunday the 4th of April,* 1813. *By Joseph Barrett.* 8vo. pp. 21. J. Johnson, and Co.

The agitation of the question of the renewal of the Charter of the East India Company has excited a very laudable anxiety in the religious public to provide for the legal security of Christian missionaries and teachers, in our Indian territories. To mere politicians, the object may appear doubtful or impracticable; but Christians can scarcely hesitate for a moment, in making up their minds as to the importance, the right or the duty of propagating the gospel amongst heathens. Mr. Barrett has very temperately, but ably, stated what we, and what we trust the mass of our Christian countrymen, think and feel on the subject, and has satisfactorily refuted the common objections to the efforts to Christianize the East. We cordially recommend his discourse to such of our readers as take, (and we trust there is not one who does not take) an interest in this momentous question.

Art. III. *A New Directory for Nonconformist Churches, containing free Remarks on their Mode of Public Worship, and a Plan for the Improvement of it, addressed to Dissenting Ministers, &c.* 8vo. pp. 170. Johnson, 1812.

This work, which is a thin octavo volume, unquestionably merits the attention of those persons to whom it is expressly addressed, as well as to their hearers and others concerned. It is, we are told, entitled "*A new Directory,* with reference to that which was set forth by the venerable Assembly of Divines, A. D. 1645." Of this latter we have an account in the third volume of Dr. Toulmin's edition of Neal's History of the Puritans; and a copy of it makes the eighth article in the Appendix to that work. It is not an absolute form of devotion, but, as its title imports, it contains some general directions, taken partly from the scriptures, and partly from rules of Christian prudence; it points out the heads of public prayer, of preaching, and other parts of the pastoral function, leaving the minister a discretionary latitude to fill up the outline, according to his own inclination. It comprehends the peculiarities of the old Presbyterian form of worship. It takes for granted, that all things will be done in order, and for the edification of the persons assembled for divine worship;—that extemporary prayer is the only proper mode of address to the Deity; and that this mode would be conducted with propriety.

The *New* directory, if not the work of an ASSEMBLY, properly so called, is, at least, the result of the wisdom and experience of three persons, who seem well acquainted with the public services of non-conformist divines, who have frequently attended the ministrations of popular preachers, and who have been occasionally shocked, as every serious person must be, at the familiar and indecent addresses sometimes offered to the omnipotent God, under the form of prayers. We have, accordingly, after some introductory observations on public worship; and a chapter on the advantages and disadvantages of an invariable use of extemporary prayer, an account of the improprieties in the prayers of certain individuals, and on public occasions. To facts very similar to those detailed in the new Directory we have ourselves been frequently the witnesses, and we apprehend that they occur almost perpetually among preachers who have little to recommend themselves but a boisterous assurance, and an apparent familiarity with the Creator of the Universe, which no humble worshipper of his Maker can, or ought to assume.

To those, therefore, who constantly use extemporary prayer, and to others who attend upon ministers that never deviate from the custom, we earnestly recommend an attention to the work before us. It is no caricature of the practice complained of: it is no exaggeration of facts as they really exist: the picture would have borne a much higher colouring, and would still have been only a fair and candid representation.

We come next to the remedies proposed, which cannot be well understood but by those who are accustomed to Dissenting modes of worship, and who are occasionally wearied with what are called, and properly called, *long* prayers. As if the Almighty were to be appeased, or to be rendered beneficient by many words, the prayers of some divines will run out to 40 or 50 minutes, although every sentiment uttered might be expressed in eight or ten; but either the minister thus addressing his Maker wishes to establish his credit for being more gifted than his brethren: or he is not aware that his prayers thus unnecessarily protracted are mere tautologies, which he would be ashamed to use were he addressing himself to a fellow-creature, in, perhaps, a higher station of life than that in which he himself moves. To remedy this evil the authors of the *New* Directory recommend what is called the *long* prayer to be divided into two.

This was the advice of Mr. Orton, but we believe it did not answer: we remember that it was adopted a few years since by a very respectable minister in London, and was continued by him till he quitted the metropolis for a distant county. We observed one inconvenience attaching to it: ministers who occasionally officiated for him, not knowing, or at least not adopting his method, were put to confusion by the congregation not exactly knowing when they were to rise to offer up their prayers, and when to remain sitting while, perhaps, the scriptures were read. It is true that inconveniences of this sort must occur by every innovation upon the usual practice, and therefore they ought not to bar the road to rational attempts to improvement. If, however, ministers would confine themselves within proper bounds, there would be no great necessity for this change; those who make use of extemporary prayers, instead of written ones, or praying memoriter, seldom have such a command of ideas, or rather of words, for we do not give them credit for an exuberance of ideas, as to avoid tautologous phrases, which are the causes of the evil complained of. Hence say the authors of the New Directory, if extemporary prayers are comprehensive there is danger of their becoming proilx and tedious. To do justice to all the several parts of prayer, in a methodical, pertinent and concise manner, in the extemporary mode, is no easy matter; as a relief therefore to those who feel these difficulties, they recommend the adopting of SUPPLEMENTARY FORMS, taken entirely from the Scriptures; which are admirably adapted for the purposes of devotion: as they contain nothing liable to doubtful disputation, and as the language of the sacred writings is peculiarly adapted to public worship, beyond any thing merely human, whether immediately conceived by the person who leads the service, or whether previously composed with ever so much care.—But some object to *written* forms, and recommend young ministers to make themselves acquainted with the devotional parts of scripture, and commit to memory such passages as are best adapted to public woship: to this it is replied that the attempt to recollect particular passages of scripture may prove a great impediment to devotion, occasion embarrassment to the minister, and have an unhappy influence on the congregation.

"Now such inconveniences as these," say the authors of the New Directory, "which attend a mere reliance on the memory, in the recital of scripture passages in prayer, will be effectually prevented, and every desirable use of them secured, by having a fair copy of them before the eye of the minister, which he may read as he has occasion, or otherwise pronounce as he may find liberty; for we do not recommend it to ministers slavishly to confine themselves to the reading either prayers or sermons, but rather to use freedom of delivery in both. And what rational objection can be made against their availing themselves of such a help to the memory in the one case more than in the other, which is allowed in most of our societies? Or what possible disadvantage can arise from reading a prayer from the Bible, or from a written copy, more than repeating it by rote, which in fact is reading it from the tablet of the memory; for that (as a great divine* expresses it) "is an invisible book," which is read by the eye of the mind, as the other is by the bodily eye. The latter is, in fact, the most favourable to the real devotion of the speaker; and to the people both are equal: for a prayer delivered from the memory is as really a Form as one that is read from a book; and indeed to the people, even an extemporary prayer is as much a Form to them as either; since they are as much confined to the sentiments and the words of the minister in the one case as in the other."

The next chapter of the work before us, is a statement of objections, to the plan recommended, with suitable replies: then comes chapter VI. containing "A plan of Worship for Dissenting Congregations," which we shall briefly lay before our readers.

---

* Bishop Wilkins on Prayer.

Let the public service on the Lord's-day, begin with reading a few short passages of scripture, such as relate to the resurrection of Christ:—the privileges of Christianity;—the nature, pleasure and benefit of divine worship. The New Directory likewise adds passages on the *institution of the Sabbath:* but as no such passages occur in the New Testament, and as Christians assemble as adherents to the religion of their master, Christ, and not to the Mosaic system, we demur to this part of the advice, and still more to the recommendation of praising God in Christian worship for the appointment of the Sabbath, *as a memorial of the creation*, because this carries us to the reason assigned in the 20th chapter of Exodus for the institution of the Sabbath, which (we speak it with due reverence) seems not more absurd than it is childish. The true reason for the institution of the Sabbath appears to us to be recorded in the fifth chapter of the book of Deuteronomy, which says, after repeating the commandment appointing the seventh day as a day for the observance of religious duties, "that thy man servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well thou: for remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched arm, therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." Here there is no reference to the cessations of labour of the Creator, but motives of benevolence are assigned in making it a day of rest to inferiors; and reason for gratitude in the higher walks of life, which were to be excited by the recollection of a deliverance from past calamities.

But to proceed to the Directory: after reading some suitable passages of scripture, to solemnize the heart and prepare it for the duties in which it is about to engage, and to excite in the worshipper emotions of gratitude, a short extemporary prayer is recommended; then the singing of a general hymn or psalm; after which a a lesson from the Old Testament is to be read, accompanied with short explanatory and practical observations, and this is to be followed by a general prayer, taken chiefly from the book of Psalms. Next is to follow a second lesson from the New Testament, accompanied also with observations and remarks: then a short extemporary prayer, to which is to be added the intercessory prayer, consisting partly of scripture passages and partly of such free petitions as there may be found occasion to introduce, with reference to particular cases. Another hymn is now to be sung: then the sermon; after this, there is likewise to be singing, and a short extemporary prayer is to conclude the service.

Such is the plan of worship recommended in the New Directory, to which we feel some objections, and to others different objections will no doubt occur. The authors have anticipated many that they imagined might be produced and have answered, and, perhaps, in some cases, obviated them. Our limits do not allow us to pursue the subject much farther: we wish the authors would complete their plan by compiling, for the public, scriptural forms of worship: and we earnestly recommend to our readers the seventh and eighth chapters of the New Directory on this subject and on that of Doxologies. It certainly behoves serious and candid ministers to consider well the propriety of their own conduct, if, (as too many of them do) they discard all the scripture doxologies, and substitute in their room those of human invention, decidedly contrary to any thing to be found in the Old and New Testament: and it is observable, that this custom or practice is not to be met with among Unitarians, who do not in general believe in the plenary inspiration of every thing contained in the scriptures, but among others who, while they maintain this doctrine, yet substitute absurd and idolatrous doxologies for those made use of by the apostles. To such we may say, in the words of the authors before us,

"If scripture be a safe and sufficient rule of faith, of practice, and of worship, whoever they be that object to the scripture forms of doxology or benediction, *they* may, with more appearance of justice, be suspected of unsound principles, than those who prefer these to any human modes of expression, however sanctioned by great names of antiquity, on the one hand, or modern reasoning on the other."

Our readers will, by the above account, see the drift and object of the work under consideration: it is written with simplicity and Christian candour: it merits the attention of Christians in general, and particularly of Dissenters: much may be said in defence of liturgies, much in behalf of written, and even extemporary prayers, when used with sound judgment and supeiior talents, the object of the New Directory is to press the us of these in conjunction, making the written part to consist chiefly or wholly of scriptural expressions, against which, as far as the *matter* is concerned, none can object.

Upon carefully examining the plan, which we have thus detailed, we think that what the authors praise, as giving *variety* to their method, would be more praiseworthy if there were fewer parts in their mode of worship: we admire the introduction of the service by a solemn and grateful enunciation of certain passages of scripture; we think equally well of the reading of the scriptures with short comments and practical observations, which may be introduced after a brief introductory prayer, but surely what is called the long prayer need not be divided, and need not (as we know we shall not be heard for much speaking) be lengthened beyond ten or twelve minutes, so that the whole service, with a sermon, concluding prayer, and twice, or at most thrice, singing, would not necessarily require more than an hour or an hour and a quarter, which would leave room for a familiar lecture on important subjects, to those who will devote a few additional minutes in attending it. After all, with the writers of the New Directory, we leave our readers impartially to judge for themselves, recommending, on far higher authority, that "All things be done decently and to edification."

When the *Second Part of the*

Directory is published, we hope to hear that the experiment has been made upon the plan recommended in the first part, and we shall be happy to give an early record of its success.

SOCIUS.

Art. IV. *An humble Vindication of Unitarianism, being a Second Edition of a Letter addressed to the Unitarian Society, Rolovenden, Kent. By S. Dobell.* price 3d.

Art. V. *The Morning Visit; or a Dialogue between an Apprentice, his Father and his Master. By S. Dobell.* price 6d. Eaton.

The first of these pamphlets is a judicious and serious address to unlearned Unitarians; well adapted to impress their minds with a sense of the importance of their principles, and of the necessity of cultivating such a spirit and temper as may be the means of recommending them to others.

The "Morning Visit," is an entertaining dialogue on the grounds of Unitarian dissent from the establishment. It is intended to remove the prejudices of serious churchmen, against those, who in conformity to the dictates of their consciences, worship God the Father only, and attend at those meetings where no other person or being is worshipped. We understand that it was suggested by a circumstance which took place in, or near the neighbourhood.

Art. VI. *The Titles and Attributes of God no Proof of the Divinity of Him to whom they are ascribed; a Sermon, preached before the Southern Unitarian Society. By William Hughes.* 12mo. pp. 36. Isle of Wight printed; sold by Johnson and Co. and Eaton, London.

This is an ingenious attempt to revive the hypothesis of *Benjamin Ben Mordecai*[*] that the visible Jehovah of the Old Testament, the actual Creator of the world, the 'Angel of the Covenant,' was Jesus Christ in his pre-existent state. We question whether the hypothesis will be thought sufficiently plausible to excite a new discussion of it. Mr. Lindsey has ably, and, we think, successfully, controverted it in the *Sequel to the Apology* (pp. 295—386). Could Jesus Christ be proved to be the Creator of mankind, we see not how his right to divine worship, could be disproved. Ben Mordecai consistently, though against all evidence, contended for his having been the object of the tabernacle and temple worship.

While, however, we object to the drift of this discourse, we are pleased with both its ingenuity and candour; and there are passages in it (see, particularly, the *note*, pp. 14—17) which contain as strong and well stated arguments for Unitarianism as we are acquainted with.

---

[*] See "The Apology of Benjamin Ben Mordecai to his friends, for embracing Christianity; in seven letters to Elisha Levi, Merchant of Amsterdam. Together with an Eighth Letter on the Generation of Jesus Christ, with Notes and Illustrations, 2nd edition. By Henry Taylor, A. M. Rector of Crawley, and Vicar of Portsmouth, in Hants." In 2 vols. 8vo. 1784.

INTELLIGENCE.

Unitarian Society.

The anniversary of the London Unitarian Book Society was held on Thursday, the 8th inst. Ebenezer Johnston, Esq. in the Chair. The success of this Society in suggesting and supporting other similar societies, becomes every year more apparent, and forms an increasing proof of the value of the parent institution. It was announced to the Annual Meeting that the sale of the large impressions of the several copies of the Improved Version, is such as to justify the hope of a new edition, for which measures are taking.

Unitarian Fund.

The Annual Meeting of this Society will be holden as usual, on the Wednesday in Whitsun week, June 9th: the Sermon to be preached by the Rev. E. Butcher, of Sidmouth. Further particulars in our next.

Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty.

The Anniversary Meeting of this Institution which has essentially promoted the cause of toleration, and which will, we hope, make future and effectual efforts for the attainment of that complete Religious Liberty which we advocate, will occur on Saturday, May 15, at the New London Tavern, Cheapside, at 11 o'clock precisely, when we presume that a numerous assembly will be collected to receive the Report of the interesting proceedings of the Committee, during the past year; and we are requested to remind our readers that the small annual contributions from the congregations connected with that Society, are become due, and should be immediately remitted to enable them to meet the great expenses they unavoidably incur.

Religious Liberty in India.

At a general Meeting of the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations, residing in and about the Cities of London and Westminster, holden at the Library in Redcross Street, on Tuesday, April 20, 1813.

The Rev. William Newman in the Chair.

RESOLVED,

1. That any public measure, connected with the rights of conscience, the unrestricted liberty of worship, and the extension of the Christian religion, is a proper object of attention to this body.

2. That the vast extent of territory and power, which the British nation has acquired in the East Indies, bears an important relation to all those great principles.

3. That it appears, by satisfactory evidence, that the natives of this country, resident in India, are, in many stations, unprovided with the means of Christian worship and instruction; that, in other situations, where the defect is not total, the modes of worship, which this body prefers, are exercised only by permission; and that such permission is a matter of connivance, and is held on an arbitrary and precarious tenure.

4. That it is equally established by evidence, that the greater part of the native population of the territory, now under his majesty's dominion, consists of heathens, enslaved by immoral and cruel superstitions, which are degrading to the individual and social character of man, and destructive to human happiness, to a degree scarcely paralleled in the history of mankind.

5. That, in the conscientious persuasion of this body, the Christian religion, in its pure profession and practice, would be an effectual remedy for those moral disorders.

6. That it is the duty of all Christians to employ all proper means of proposing the claims and evidences of Christianity to their fellow-men universally; disavowing the employment of coercion, artifice, or any other means of persuasion, except those of fair argument and blameless lives.

7. That the members of this body recognise as brethren, those laborious and learned ministers of different denominations, who have gone to India with the benevolent purpose, of gratuitously intructing those who are willing to learn the principles of Christian knowledge.

8. That the members of this body do respectfully and firmly assert for themselves, for their brethren, and for their children, who may enter into the Christian ministry, a natural and unalienable right to preach, teach, and worship, in whatever place, opportunity may be afforded, so long as they conduct themselves as upright and peaceable members of civil society.

9. That the power possessed by the Honourable East India Company, of prohibiting the residence of Christian teachers in the Indian territory, is unjust on the great principles of religious liberty; and that the exercise of such power must, in every case, be a violation, deeply to be lamented, of the high command of heaven.

10. That as measures for the future government of India are now under the consideration of the legislature, petitions be presented from this body to both houses of parliament, praying for the enactment of such laws, as shall protect Christian ministers and missionaries, of all denominations, in the exercise of their functions, so long as they approve themselves to be loyal subjects of the British crown.

The Spring Quarterly Meeting of Presbyterian Ministers in Manchester and its vicinity, was held on last Good Friday, at the Rev. Mr. J. Bealey's chapel, at Cockeymoor. Mr. Allard, of Bury, introduced the service, and Mr. Dean, of Stand, preached from Acts x. 1, 2. The chapel was well attended, and the audience was serious and attentive. A dinner, suitable to the occasion, was provided at a very large and commodious school-room, belonging to, and near the chapel, capable of accommodating from five to six hundred scholars. About forty gentlemen sat down to dinner; and after spending together a very agreeable afternoon, separated between five and six o'clock.

The Meeting learnt with satisfaction that a new Unitarian congregation at Oldham is forming.

Manchester, W. J.
April, 19, 1813.

NO POPERY.

Proceedings at Exeter.

(In a Letter to the Editor.)

Concluded from p. 220.

This was read in George's Meeting by both the ministers; and we stated the circumstances which had led us to propose it. The members of our congregation very generally came forward on the occasion, in a manner which shewed that they duly appreciate the rights of conscience. Of the other congregations some few nobly resisted the popular clamour, and added their names to our petitions; but the general voice was decidedly against us. Lord Rolle stated that the Dissenters' anti-Catholic petition had 500 signatures; I had heard above 300; but we have reason to believe that *all* the signatures were not good ones. If all the names were struck out, of Dissenters not belonging to Exeter, of those who were Dissenters only *for the time being*, and of those who gave double or *treble* signatures, in all probability the majority would have been less considerable.

In the interval between the services, we endeavoured to make our petition known to the other congregations of Dissenters, (but I believe one minister was omitted, through a defect in our arrangement.)—I mention the fact, to add, that it gave us an opportunity of witnessing, with great satisfaction, among a few of the Wesleyan Methodists, the vindications of zealous attachment to religious liberty, which I hope will eventually leaven the whole lump. The greater part of them, however, seem to have been effectually alarmed by the tracts of the Protestant

Union, &c. out of that spirit which Lord Sidmouth's futile efforts had roused in their body.

On Monday night our petition had about 180 signatures, all I believe *good* ones: and we then forwarded it, (as we had before done the general counter petition, to James Esdaile, Esq. who kindly undertook to deliver them to Lord Holland and Mr. Whitbread, from whom they met with a very flattering reception.—A copy was the same night sent to Honiton, where I understand it was signed by every Dissenter in the place. The Dissenting anti-Catholic Petition was presented by the city members, and by Lord Rolle, whose hostility to the Dissenters has, I have heard, been strongly marked on various occasions.

Here we hoped the anti-Catholic proceedings would terminate; but some zealots excited a number of the neighbouring farmers to set forward a County Meeting; and at their requisition the Sheriff appointed one to be held on Friday, March the 12th.—Various efforts were made to enlighten the public mind, which, though apparently without much immediate effect, must eventually be of service. By the laudable exertions of a few individuals, (which met with a cheerful countenance from other friends of the cause,) a pamphlet was printed, containing the greater part of Butler's Letter to the English Protestants, and such facts respecting the state of the Irish Catholics, and the opinions of our leading statesmen, as seemed likely to change or neutralize the popular feelings on the subject; and about 1000 copies were distributed as extensively as circumstances permitted. A gentleman of the Calvinistic persuasion, (whose zealous, firm, and enlightened attachment to the rights of conscience has afforded us peculiar satisfaction,) received a considerable number of tracts from the Rev. Mark Wilks; and another parcel came afterwards to myself from the same quarter. These too we distributed as beneficially as we could; and if they do no more, they will I trust assist in preparing the minds of the misguided anti-Catholic party, for a quiet acquiescence in the measures which the late proceedings of the Commons authorize us to hope will now be carried.

Our hopes as to the result of the County Meeting had been somewhat raised by the expectation that some of the leading landholders would give their personal assistance in counteracting the misrepresentations so plentifully employed by the most prominent opponents of the Catholic claims: we found, however, that they meant merely to send a letter to the sheriff, protesting against the measure of petitioning the House of Lords in the present state of the business in the Commons. After the question had been decided, this letter was read, signed I think by the Dukes of Bedford and Somerset, Earl Fortescue, (the Lord Lieutenant of the County) and Lords Boringdon, Ashburton, and Ebrington.—The particulars of the meeting will I suppose appear in the newspapers: I will only observe as to its decision, that in the Court there appeared to be a majority in favour of the amendment, (which was moved by Mr. A. C. Tucker, of Ashburton, after a very animated and impressive speech,) —that after the adjournment to the Castle Yard, in order to accommodate the persons without, the majority, though I think in favour of the original petition, was not by any means a striking one,—and that it was not till the Sheriff directed a separation of the Freeholders, that the majority was declared by the Sheriff to be two to one. This separation of Freeholders was the less justifiable, because the Requisitionists, styling themselves Freeholders, requested a meeting of the *landholders*, because the Sheriff simply called a *County Meeting*, because the Petition proposed purported to be the petition of "the Gentlemen, Clergy, Yeomanry, Freeholders, and Landholders," and because I understand —they are admitting the signatures of those who are not Freeholders.

I should not have adverted to the County Meeting if it had not been to notice, that it has called forth the decided and zealous expression of sentiments in favour of unrestrained religious liberty to all, from some Calvinistic Ministers. The Rev. Mr. Vowles of Tiverton, in a speech which does him honour, (and for which I hope you will find room at the close of this letter,) ably supported the amendment: and in the evening several Calvinistic Ministers met, and drew up a petition for the removal of all restraints on the rights of conscience, to be signed by the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of Devon. In this measure they had the cheerful concurrence of their less orthodox brethren;

but the merit of originating it, and of carrying it into execution rests wholly with themselves.

The Reverend gentleman who is reported to have been the chief private promoter, as well as public supporter of the anti-Catholic proceedings, has not hesitated to stimulate the popular feelings against those Dissenters who have come forwards to oppose them; according to him, they spoke "one word for the Roman Catholics and two for themselves." If I may judge from the speeches of that gentleman, I should suppose him incapable of comprehending how any person could zealously espouse the Catholic cause, upon the broad basis of right and justice, and from a disinterested concern to remove pressures which are so severely felt by those whose faith they consider as decidedly erroneous. By such motives I trust we have been influenced. For myself I can say with confidence, that if the rights of the Dissenters could in no way be promoted by the Catholic emancipation, —if they would certainly be impeded by it,—I should have felt the same earnest desire for the attainment of it, and have pursued precisely the same track in which that desire has already led me. I wish to see the remaining encroachments on the Dissenters' rights removed, because I regard them as a disgrace to my country, as unjust to the Dissenters, and as a snare which has led too many to the forfeiture of their principles: but farther than this, I do not think their removal worth an effort: I do not believe that it would contribute to the worth or respectability of the Dissenting body to be in the possession of those places of honour or profit, from which the Corporation and Test Laws now exclude them.—The insinuation was equally unjust and ungenerous; but I hope it chiefly affects our minds, as furnishing another motive to the ignorant yeomanry of the County to oppose the Catholic claims.

On the day when intolerance gained a new triumph in this place, we had the satisfaction of learning, that the House of Commons had proceeded with additional success in its career of justice and enlightened policy: and I trust it will not be very long before they will offer to the Lords some well digested plan of mutual conciliation and security, which may remove the alarm now excited by the phantoms of bigotry, and convince even the bench of bishops, that they may accede to the claims of the Catholics, without endangering the honours and emoluments of the established Church.

L.C.

OBITUARY.

Rev. John Atchison.

On Tuesday, Feb. the 9th, died at Leicester, the Rev John Atchison, a man whose talents, attainments and virtues, would have given him no mean distinction in the eye of the world, had not an unparalleled modesty and diffidence concealed them as much as possible from observation. But retired and unassuming worth, should not quit this scene of discipline, without receiving the tribute of applause, nor intellectual and moral excellence go unrecorded, because it shrunk with delicate sensibility from public notice, or because its possessor was unconscious of his treasure. In the present case, however, the writer who has undertaken to give a brief account of a departed friend, will so far be guided by what were once *his* feelings, as rather to withhold from him the praise which is his due, than to embalm his memory with a studied encomium. He was born in March 1743, at Everdon in Northamptonshire, and was for sometime at Northampton, under the care of the Rev. Mr. Gilbert, where he was remarked as a youth of a studious and reflecting turn of mind. From Northampton he went to Daventry, in order to go through a course of studies preparatory to the office of dissenting minister. He continued there the usual term, under the care of Dr. Ashworth. Of his academical life the writer of this memoir possesses no particulars, but the uniform respectability of his character, furnishes the strongest presumption that he was among the most amiable and diligent of the students of his day, and that he then exhibited the fair promise not only of his future talents, but of the virtues by which he was distinguished. After the expiration of his academical course, he settled at Gorton in Lancashire, where he resided 20 years, highly respected and beloved by the congregation in which he officiated. There he married Miss Tayler, daughter of —— Tayler, Esq. of Rochdale, by whom he had two daughters, one of whom survives him. It will naturally be supposed, that the extraordinary diffidence which was spoken of above, must have made it peculiarly unpleasant to Mr. Atchison to make that public exhibition of himself, which was required by the duties of his office as a Christian minister, and hence it will not excite surprise to learn that at length, when he could not conquer this infirmity, he resigned the care of the congregation at Gorton, and for a time preached occasionally, when his benevolence led him to sacrifice his own feelings to the convenience of a friend. Upon giving up his occupation as a stated minister, he removed to Leicester, in order to enjoy the society of some of his relations who resided in that town. Here he devoted himself to the pursuits of literature, in which he took a wide and varied range. Few men perhaps read more, or with more minuteness of observation, and solidity of judgment. At length the pleasing task of educating his two daughters, occupied a considerable share of his time and attention. How well he was qualified for such a task, the success which followed his affectionate labours most unequivocally proved. He stored his beloved pupils with a rich variety of information, such as the enlightened spirit of the present day, acknowledges to be the appropriate ornament of a female mind. But here an event must be stated, which the writer cannot record without a trembling hand. Nearly two years ago, his eldest daughter, Lucy, who, combined with every feminine virtue, a manly strength of mind, and a habit of reflection, not often found in either sex, fell a victim to a consumption in her one and twentieth year. It need not be said how he felt this lamentable bereavement; but he bore it, as those who knew him predicted he would, with the calm and dignified fortitude of a philosopher and a Christian. His constitution, however, probably received a shock from which it never recovered, and perhaps his grief might prey the more upon his frame, as it did not vent itself in empassioned expressions. In the course of last summer, his sources of enjoyment were again materially diminished by the death of his sister, the late Mrs. Reid, of Leicester, to whom he was with reason most tenderly attached, and from whose society he had long derived a considerable share of his satisfaction.

After this latter shock, the infirmities of age began to appear in him, and at length, after an illness from which he had seemed to be recovering, he expired suddenly in a fainting fit, without a struggle, quitting the world as quietly as he had passed through it.

His singular modesty, and habits equally retired, rendered it difficult to those who did not know him intimately to lay hold of the prominent features of his character. His diffidence indeed was the quality which was most obvious; which none could fail to observe, and which all his acquaintance lamented as a loss to themselves. But the few who were familiar with him knew him to have been a man of sound learning, of correct judgment, and of a highly cultivated taste. They regarded him also as a man of sincere but rational piety, and whose conduct through life was in the highest degree exemplary and consistent.

His compositions for the pulpit were esteemed singularly neat and judicious. His manner would not have suited a society which preferred *sound* to *sense*, or even the graces of elocution to a discourse replete with solid and useful matter. In religious sentiments, he was not inclined to either extreme, but his connection was with the most liberal Dissenters, none of whom surpassed him in liberality. Indeed he was more solicitous about his *practice* than his *faith*, and endeavoured to be, what they who knew him best believe him to have been, a Christian in heart and life.

Mr. John Coventry.

[In a Letter to the Editor.]

Mitcham, Surry, Jan. 8, 1813.

Sir,

I have had several instances of observing how very sanguine some, even pious men, are, in catching at every opportunity of exposing what they are pleased to call "dangerous errors;" and I fear this is sometimes done, even at the expence of truth itself. The following case will, I think, justify my assertion,

A worthy Christian friend of mine, Mr. John Coventry, many years a resident in the parish of Saint Saviour's, Southwark, a man universally respected by all who knew him, and whom I have known for nearly fifty years, was visited in his last illness by his son-in-law the Rev. Mr. Mann, who is chaplain of the said parish. My friend departed this life the fourth day of December last, and on the 27th a funeral sermon was delivered by Mr. M. on the occasion, at the parish church.

The preacher took the occasion of shewing the causes which frequently operate on the minds of persons in dying circumstances, to produce that distress which sometimes is seen; and with respect to my deceased friend, expressed himself in nearly the following words, as given to me by a person present. "I am satisfied that the principal cause of the distress of mind which disturbed the deceased, was owing to his having imbibed *wrong opinions*. In earlier life he had embraced the Winchesterian system of universal restoration; upon which subject I have had many serious conversations with him, which I know on his death-bed he sincerely deplored and deeply lamented. The deceased informed me that about seven years ago he began to see his error, and that he had sent for an old and much-respected friend, to state to him the change of his mind, and likewise to warn him of the like error." Now, Sir, from the report of all the family who attended my dying friend, it appears that I am the old friend alluded to, and of which there cannot be the least doubt, since we have been intimately acquainted for many years. It is true the deceased did twice send for me, and we had some religious conversation together; yet he never once intimated to me the least change in his mind respecting his view of the restoration of all mankind; nor did he *warn* me of the "*dangerous error*," as Mr. M. is pleased to call it.

Within the period which Mr. M. alludes to, he has married the daughter of the deceased; it is therefore not a matter of surprise, that the deceased has of late attended the ministry of his son-in-law; but from many conversations which I have had with him, I have every reason to believe that he never did change his sentiment in this particular; but that, on the contrary, he has for these thirty years fully believed in the doctrine, and rejoiced in the glorious view of the same. Upon what account, therefore, Mr. M. is pleased to call all those who believe in this doctrine "mere quibblers," I cannot conceive; since, I believe, there are few men, who in their general character, have displayed the marks of a Christian during a long life more than my valuable friend has done.

Mr. Coventry, in his early days, was a pious man, and much attached to what Mr. M. would call the *evangelical* plan of salvation; but after he received this "*unscriptural* view" of the final state of all mankind, he steadily believed that "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him."

As my deceased friend has throughout his life been an uniform character, remarkable for his patient temper and benevolent disposition, and was well known as a Christian man by several denominations of professors, I have thought it my duty to represent this valuable man and his sentiments in their proper light; and I can also assert that the uneasiness of mind, under which he was pressed when I first visited him, arose from circumstances very different from what Mr. Mann has been pleased to represent them.

I am, Sir,
Your's very respectfully,
WILLIAM BICKNELL.

Mrs. Thomas.

Died at Sandling, near Maidstone, Kent, on Tuesday, the 4th of August, 1812, Mrs. Thomas, aged 72. She was a dissenter from principle, and a regular attendant at the Unitarian Meeting-house, Maidstone. She was pious without moroseness, charitable without ostentation, and liberal to all persons, of whatever religious denomination. In her seemed united all the graces of the Christian. By her death the poor have been deprived of a kind benefactress, the young of an enlightened adviser, and her family of a most affectionate mother. The writer of this brief sketch is conscious that he is unable to do justice to the many virtues of so excellent a woman; he will only add that she will long be remembered by all who enjoyed the pleasure and happiness of her friendship. G. H.

Mr. Caleb Evans.

Died March 17, 1813, in his 71st year, Mr. Caleb Evans, of Pontypool, Monmouthshire. He was a very active and useful member of the community, when at length the infirmities of old age (that incurable disease) stole upon him, and terminated in his dissolution. He possessed a good understanding, a cheerful disposition, and a benevolent heart. To the last he retained his faculties, and expired with the humble expectation of admission into a better world. His hope was founded on the declarations of mercy made in *the gospel* of *Jesus Christ, who hath brought life and immortality to light.* In his last illness, which he bore with exemplary fortitude and resignation, he often repeated these lines:

> Leave dull mortality behind,
> And fly beyond the grave.

Beloved and respected, it is not a matter of surprise, that a more than usually large concourse of people should follow his remains to the tomb. They were happy in paying the last token of respect to his memory. His *bier* was borne from his own door for about an hundred yards, by three sons and his youngest son-in-law, according to an ancient and affecting custom of the Principality. Having thought much on religious subjects, his views were rational, aiming to shun the extremes of enthusiasm and superstition, whilst he felt a strong aversion to every species of uncharitableness and bigotry. Most honourable were his ideas of the Supreme Being. *To do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God*, was, in his opinion, the sum and substance of Christianity. He and the late *Dr. Caleb Evans*, of Bristol, were brothers' children. His eldest son, agreeably to the desire of the deceased, improved the event of his death at Worship Street, from Job xiv. 1, 2. MAN, *that is born of a woman, is of few days and full of trouble; he cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down, he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not.* His selection of this passage did not arise from his having had a more than ordinary portion of anxiety attaching to his lot, but his mind bending beneath the pressure of years, was struck with the evanescent nature and constant vicissitudes of mortality. He was a GOOD FATHER. Indeed, few persons were more interested in the welfare and prosperity of their offspring.

> Some feelings are to mortals given,
> With less of earth in them than heaven;
> And if there be an human tear,
> From passion's dross refined and clear,
> A tear so limpid and so meek,
> It would not stain an angel's cheek,
> 'Tis that which aged parents shed
> Upon their duteous children's head.

Throughout life he was *the lover of peace*, as well as the friend of CIVIL and RELIGIOUS liberty.

Filial affection, with a tremulous hand, consecrates this *very summary account* to a beloved parent's memory.

Islington, April 26, 1813.

Rev. Samuel Girle.

April 19th, at his house in Bethnal Green, the REV. SAMUEL GIRLE, aged 56. His departure was sudden. He had gone down to Reading to preach to the Unitarian congregation there, on account of the Unitarian Fund; but owing to a violent pulmonary affection, was unable to officiate more than one Sunday. He returned home only the evening before the day of his death.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

The Catholic question has occasioned no small stir in the religious world, and to this has succeeded one of considerable importance to the East Indies. Here is a wide field for contemplation, and with it no small occasion for grief at the state of Christianity in these extensive regions. The English name is revered through the whole peninsula of Hindostan. The natives have received our yoke, comparatively light in respect to that which their Mahometan conquerors pressed upon them: but if our dominion and our commerce have been greatly enlarged, we cannot boast of having made any progress in rescuing the country from the horrid superstition under which it labours. It may be said, that we ought not to interfere with the religion of a country, and that the rights of conscience ought to be respected. In this we most cordially agree: but, if a heathen nation could, in a treaty, make one of its articles to be the abolition of human sacrifices, surely, in the time that we have had possession of India, some of its inhuman rites might have been abolished without injury to just toleration.

The question is now taken up in a very serious manner, and important consequences may be expected from the discussion. To understand it rightly, we must consider what is the state of religion, and what steps are taken to promote its progress in the East. The great mass of the population consists of idolaters, in the grossest sense of the word. In one part is a body of native Christians, which has been established there for many centuries, under the forms of the Syrian Church. Of the European settlers, the old ones are Catholics, and they have not only magnificent churches, but also the horrid court of the Inquisition. The Danes have a few Protestant churches. The English have scarcely any congregations, and religion may be said to have been for many years neglected by them. This state of the country, however, could not be long endured, and a spirit arose, chiefly excited by the Baptists at home, who sent out missionaries into those benighted regions, and by their efforts the gospels have been translated into all the languages of Hindostan. An alarm, however, seems to have been excited, lest the preaching of Christianity should be attended with dangerous consequences, and that such an innovation as the conversion of the heathen might tend to shake the stability of our possessions in India.

Unquestionably we cannot expect that a government should be influenced by the same zeal which animates the breast of a missionary: and if it finds that the nations may be easily governed by leaving them alone under their ancient prejudices, it may be apprehensive of the consequences from their being disturbed. But surely this apprehension of danger ought not to militate with the sacred duty of every christian people, to promote as much as possible the kingdom of the Redeemer. There may be danger from the operations of excessive or misguided zeal, but this will not excuse complete apathy, much less any opposition to well-directed endeavours to correct the errors of the ignorant, and to communicate to them the treasures of the gospel. If we are benefited by them in temporal things, surely we are inexcusable if we do not invite them to be partakers with us, in what are spiritual.

The present application for a new charter by the East India Company brings the question home to every man's bosom, and it is with great satisfaction we have seen so many petitions presented to parliament by various bodies of men for religious freedom in India, and for some security that the persons, who are promoting the cause of Christianity, should, to say the least, not be discountenanced by the ruling powers. Several high characters, very conversant with the manners and customs of the East, have been examined by the House of Commons: but after a few days it was agreed that the subject of religion should be reserved. Their opinions however, tended in general to countenance the idea of such complete prejudice on the part of the natives, that little good could be expected from any attempt to convert them, and that any interference with respect to religious opinions might be attended with dangerous consequences.

The question must, however, undergo a very serious discussion. Lord Castlereagh, by his resolutions, of which the last relates to the appointment of a Bishop and Archdeacon of the established church, shews that something must be done on this head, and the advocates for religious truth have now to be on their guard, not only, that in the new charter religion shall have some place, but also that in the modification of the plan due care be taken, lest the favour shewn to the established sect should paralise or destroy the efforts of those sects, which hitherto have shewn the most zeal in the cause. In what manner to draw the line between the sect established by law, and the sects not established by law, and in what manner to preserve the jurisdiction of the company, and at the same time to give sufficient scope to the energies of the missionary, great prudence may be requisite; but we shall hope, that in this respect the councils of the nation will be directed rather by the greatness of the object than the timidity of those persons, whose attention was directed whilst in India more to civil than to religious concerns, and who could not have been expected to enter into the discussion of the superiority of the Testament over the Shastres and Vidas of their superstitious subjects.

We were in hopes to have laid before our readers the arrangements intended with respect to the catholics. The heads of a bill for this purpose were to have been brought into the house before the holidays, but in so great a question delay is very excusable, and in the able hands, to which it is committed, we cannot doubt that they will profit by delay, to make the whole as acceptable to all parties as possible. Every account from Ireland manifests that the people are contented with the progress already made, and in full hopes that justice will be done to them. We trust that they will not be disappointed; and that in fact all parties will see the propriety, every day more and more, of separating religion from politics, and allowing the sovereign to benefit equally by the talents of all persuasions.

A bill of importance also to religion has been brought into parliament by Sir W. Scott, the gentleman whose trial we noticed in our last, and on whom the verdict of the jury cannot but have produced some good effect in the proposed measure. He, it will be remembered, excommunicated a person for refusing to be guardian to an unworthy son, and was sentenced to damages and costs of suit for this power assumed in his courts. He has now brought in a bill, relative to ecclesiastical courts, of which the principal objects are, 1st. to abolish excommunication, except in one or two instances. 2ndly. To regulate the courts of inferior jurisdiction, and 3rdly. to facilitate the recovery of tithes and rates. We have not seen the bill, but we cannot disguise our fears, lest the subject should be put into a worse situation than before. 1st As to the sentence of excommunication, we trust, that this will be confined only to members of that established sect; for in the one or two instances in which it is retained, it may become, when sanctioned by act of parliament, a grievous cause of harrassment to Dissenters 2. With respect to courts of inferior jurisdictions, the regulation of them will sanction, by act of parliament, whatever power is given to them, and when once that power is allowed, it is not easy to say, to what lengths it may be carried, and with what difficulty hereafter it may be shaken off. 3. The facilitating of the recovery of tithes and rates involves the rights of the greater part of the kingdom, and no small degree of care is necessary, lest any thing should slip in, which, considering the expensiveness of ecclesiastical courts and their mode of trying, may hereafter bear very hard upon the subject. We trust, that the Deputies of the Dissenters will keep a watchful eye over this bill during its progress through the two houses; and in fact, not only Dissenters, but Church men, are so interested in some point or other of these regulations, that it will require no small diligence and study, on all sides, to preserve themselves from injury.

Another important step in the progress of religious freedom has been taken in Spain, where the Cortez has shewn, that it is really in earnest in abolishing the wicked ecclesiastical courts that have so long been a disgrace to that country. The clergy, it seems, were refractory on this head, and made excuses for not reading in their churches, as was ordered, the edict for the abolition of the Inquisition. They have been called to an account for this conduct, and in such a manner as to shew these gentry, that the supreme authority is not to be trifled with. Inquiries have been made into their conduct, and they have consented, though with reluctance, to perform that duty, which they ought to have undertaken with the greatest pleasure. The priests of faction indeed may endeavour to set up the pretended authority of the church against the civil power; but in doing this they are to be taught, that their pretence of acting as ministers of Jesus is an insult to his name and to his religion. He does not give countenance to any ecclesiastical court whatever, which acts by pains or penalties. Wherever such courts exist, they must date their authority from the acts of the civil power, and they are not entitled to call themselves servants of the Redeemer, whose religion is love, but are ministers of the goverment of the country. Fire and faggot, stripes and imprisonment, are not recognised in the kingdom of our Saviour.

To these important movements, with respect to religion, must be added, the late impulse towards the Jewish nation, to convert which, a society has been formed in town, and it hath attained sufficient strength to erect a chapel, and and other buildings, for the purposes of the institution, at Bethnal Green. The foundation stone was laid by the Duke of Kent, and the ceremony was attended by a very numerous company. We cannot too much applaud the design, but our knowledge of the Jews forbids us to entertain any sanguine expectation from these efforts. The Jewish nation seems to us, to be kept apart from the rest of mankind for some great purpose, which, in its own good time, Providence will display to us, and when the veil is torn away from their hearts, and they are brought to the knowledge of the Saviour, they will have from their dispersion great opportunities of promoting his kingdom. At this moment there is an insuperable bar to their examining of the truths of Christianity, nor will it be removed, till Christians have returned to the knowledge of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, ceasing to worship him under a name, invented by scholastic divines and philosophers, and convincing the Jews that their God is the same God, who selected Abraham their Father from an idolatrous world.

The impression made on the public mind, by the charges brought against the Princess of Wales, and the discovery of their complete futility and baseness, has, as was expected, been manifested in the acts of great public bodies towards injured innocence. The city of London has addressed her royal highness upon this occasion, and the example has been followed by the votes and addresses from the city of Westminster, the borough of Southwark, the county of Monmouth, and several other places. They are expected to be very general, for the very extraordinary situation, in which so high a character has been placed, cannot but affect very materially the interests of the country.

The state of the continent is at this moment most critical. The Russians and Prussians are in the heart of Germany. Hamburgh, Dresden and Leipsick are in their possession, but the French have still Dantzick and other strong fortresses in their rears. The two combined powers have issued proclamations exciting the Germans to stand forward in defence of their liberty, and they have declared their determination to destroy the confederation of the Rhine, and to restrain France within its antient bounds. The Germans have then to choose between the French and the combined powers. Of the former they have had experience, the influence to be acquired by the Russians in the affairs of Europe is a novelty, whose effects cannot easily be calculated They promise liberty, whose government was never supposed to have very clear ideas of that word, and the new kings of Germany, whose titles and acquisitions depend upon the arrangements made by the confederations, must naturally entertain some fear for the change, which is to be made in the constitution of the country. The accounts, however, brought to us indicate, that the Germans tired of the French yoke, are eager to shake it off, and to trust to their new benefactors for amelioration in the state of their harassed country.

On the other hand, Buonaparte has been indefatigable. He has lost no time in recruiting his army, and his country has not betrayed, as might have been expected, any wish in his fallen state to remove him from the government. Time will shew, and that speedily, to what extent they have assisted him, and how far his new raised levies will maintain the glory of the French armies. His fortune seems to rest on the cast of this die, and the vigour of his mind has not by any means forsaken him. To the labours of the last campaign, and the fatigues of the escape from his army, succeeded incessant toil in the cabinet, and he has now quitted Paris to take the command of his armies on the banks of the Rhine. Changed indeed is his situation, from that, when after receiving the homage of the dependent kings, he reviewed his army of veterans on the banks of the Niemen, and led them forward impatient for the combat. The memory of the past, cannot but have made an impression on his present army. He is no longer the invincible hero. The charm is broken, and if in his first attempts he should meet with defeat, the dependent kings having no longer any confidence in him, will join with the two conferated powers to drive him beyond the Rhine. Austria at present is in suspence. Denmark seems to have taken a more decided part. Sweden has landed troops in Pomerania The great warrior is like a lion hemmed in nearly on all sides. He rushes boldly forward against his opponents; dreadful will be the conflict, and its termination awful. When will men cease to be thus the subjects of mad passion, and to destroy instead of supporting their fellow-creatures? When will they reflect on the high destination to which they are called, and, not being dazzled by the transitory splendour of what they falsely call heroism, act as becometh those who know that they must appear at the bar of Christ, where, without respect to his rank on earth, each man must render an account of his deeds, and where the vanity of human applause will be of no avail

The distress of Buonaparte does not seem to have weakened his armies in Spain, to the degree that might have been expected. He is said to have withdrawn some troops, but probably it is merely officers that he has taken, whose places have been supplied from the garrisons of France. No movement of consequence has been made by our army, but the campaign will probably soon commence, and the English will advance into Spain, where, if any thing should happen in the north to Buonaparte, their triumphs will be of more permanent utility to the independence of the peninsula. Still, however, there does not seem to be that activity in the Spaniards, which might ensure success, and the war may be carried on for years with alternate success, unless Buonaparte is compelled to withdraw his troops, or increase their number.

The United States do not give up their designs against Canada, nor does there appear to be any movement towards reconciliation. They continue to take prizes, and with their petty fleet dare to wage the unequal war. Our vessels have, however, taken such stations at the mouths of their harbours, as will prevent the warfare from being so advantageous to them as it has hitherto been, and both sides have seen enough to know, that the contest may be carried on, but to their mutual injury. Spanish America is in its usual dubious state, but if any thing, the insurgents seem to have the advantage in the province of Mexico.

THE

MONTHLY REPOSITORY

OF

Theology and General Literature.

No. LXXXIX. MAY. [Vol. VIII.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

Brief Account of the Rev. Henry Taylor, by the Rev. F. Stone.

30, *Garden-row, Southwark,*
Feb. 16, 1813.

DEAR SIR,

To fulfil my long-protracted intention to communicate to you particulars respecting my much-esteemed uncle-in-law, which came within my own knowledge, I cannot specify the place of his birth, but I have reason to think he was a native of Essex, as he was owner of a real estate in that county, which entitled him to a vote for the two knights of parliament. I believe that this estate of the Rev. Henry Taylor lay at South Weald, near Brentwood. His father, a gentleman, whose baptismal name might be Edward, I barely remember, having seen him but once, and when I was very young. He was a man of a very ready wit, and author of that well known humourous tale, in verse, "Numps, or the Apple-pye." Nor was his son inferior to him in witticism, devoid of the asperity of lashing satire and biting sarcasm. He was so pleasant a companion, that, at the temperately-convivial domestic table, he has been known, like Shakespeare's Yorick, to "set it in a roar" of laughter. If the clergy of the Church of Rome, and those of your graver correspondents, whose features, however, may sometimes relax into a smile, will not be offended, you may publish his following epigrammatic *jeu d'esprit* on the crew of a ship in distress, all members of the Church of Rome.

"It blew a hard storm, and, in utmost confusion,
The sailors all hurried to get absolution.
This done, and the load of the sins they confessed
Were transferred, as they thought, from themselves to the priest,
To lighten the ship and conclude their devotion,
They tossed the poor parson souse into the ocean."

He was also the author of an elegant copy of verses on the felicity of a married pair, entitled "Paradise Regained," for which I refer you to a volume of "Dodsley's Collection of Poems." Mr. Taylor was educated at Dr. Newcome's school, Hackney, where he formed connections among his schoolfellows, which were of essential benefit to him through life. On leaving school, he was admitted a member of Queen's College, Cambridge, and, I think, became a fellow of it. But he soon preferred the social fellowship of matrimony to the monotonous, monastic, collegiate life. He fixed his affections on my aunt, Christian Fox, the fourth and youngest daughter of my maternal grandfather, the Rev. Francis Fox, who died, prebendary of Salisbury and vicar of Saint Mary's, Reading, who did not reject his addresses. In consequence, they were soon united in wedlock; and I verily believe a happier couple never existed, till the prior death of my aunt separated her from her husband. At the time of his marriage, Mr. Taylor held the living of Whitfield, near Tetsworth, Oxon, for a minor; but was afterwards presented to a living, which he exchanged for the vicarage of Portsmouth. After some years, he succeeded to the rectory of Crawley, near Winchester, tenable with Portsmouth, through the interest of his schoolfellow, Chancellor Hoadly, son of the Bishop of Winchester. Mr. and Mrs. Taylor were blest with a numerous offspring, of which three children only are now living,—the Rev. Henry Taylor, who enjoys a benefice in Lincolnshire,—William Taylor, an eminent tin-manufacturer,—and Anna Taylor, who is domesticated with her sister-in-law, the relict of her brother, the Rev. Peter Taylor, at Tichfield, Hants, of which parish he was rector, under the patronage of Peter Delmè, Esq. his godfather, and another of his father's schoolfellows. Peter died without issue. Henry is in a state of celibacy; but William has a large family by his wife, who was a Miss Courthauld, a lady of a French Hugonot family. I could attempt to entertain you, Sir, with a narrative, in full detail, of the very narrow and almost miraculous escape of her ancestors from the sanguinary sabres of those ferocious bloodhounds, the *gens d'armes* of that bigotted tyrant, the 14th Louis, which I received from a lady of the family, who, when a child, with her parents and brother, thus providentially escaped. But the length of the narrative will not admit being comprised in this communication. Mr. Taylor preached a visitation sermon, but on a different subject from that of his nephew. He published it in the form of an Essay, under the title of "The Beauty of the Divine Œconomy." His "Letters of Benjamin Ben Mordecai to Elisha Levi," in defence of the absurd hypothesis of the Arian Trinity, by him styled the Apollinarian, are well known. His last work, as far as I know, was entitled "Thoughts on the grand Apostacy," which well merits the serious attention of the reader. Having had the misfortune to lose a good father, before I had attained the third year of my age, I had the happiness to find a classical scholar and a theological friend in my uncle, whose arguments against that most senseless hypothesis, the Athanasian Trinity in Unity, were so convincing as to confirm me in my rejection of it;—to confirm me, I repeat, because my mother has informed me of a circumstance, which has not escaped my own memory, that at a very early age, on my return from church with her on a Sunday, when the Athanasian Creed had been read, I put to her, with puerile impatience, the following curious, perplexing interrogatory, which she confessed herself inca pable of answering in a satisfactory manner: "Pray, mamma, what has the clergyman been talking of to-day? He said, The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet they are not three Gods, but one God. How can this be? I Francis, and my two brothers, Arthur and Daniel, are three boys. Can we three boys be jumbled together into one boy?" Exclusively of the advantages which, as a youth, I received from personal visits to, and occasional epistolary correspondence with, my uncle, on my election off from Charterhouse, as captain of that excellent public seminary, to University College, Oxford, I owed my knowledge of Hebrew to his kind recommendation of me to the notice of the Rev. Dr. Thomas Hunt, then Regius Professor of Hebrew in that University. The Professor, in his friendship for my uncle, with gratuitous generosity, instructed me in the language. When I was of age to take orders, my uncle gave me what is called a title, by appointing me his curate of Crawley, on which rectory he resided, and of Hunton, a chapel of ease, annexed to it. During my clerical connection with Mr. Taylor, I recollect that he lamented to me that a necessary church-reform was obstructed by *church-authority;* but that he thought it probable, I might live to be an instrument in removing that obstacle. It is worthy of remark, that not long before his death, I had addressed a letter to him, representing, that I flattered myself, that the good seed he had sown in my mind I had duly cultivated, so that it had sprung up into a plenteous harvest of fruit, to a degree of luxuriancy, he might perhaps think, which might require amputation. I added, in short, that the disciple had outstripped his master in what is called heresy, being now more of a *heresiarch* than a heretic, having renounced the pseudo-miracle of the Virgin's conception, and re-instated Joseph in the honour of being the father of Jesus of Nazareth, our Lord and Master *Christ*, or God's *Messiah*, of the seed of David, promised to the Jews. In consequence of this letter, it was settled by him, that I should make him a visit in the ensuing summer. But alas! before the time arrived for my departure, my uncle was seized with the sickness which soon terminated in his death. And now, Sir, shedding a fresh tear to the memory of my uncle, and referring you for a more circumstantial biography of him to his two sons, and for a correction of any involuntary error I may have committed in my narrative, I have the honour to be, Your obliged and

obedient Servant,

FRANCIS STONE.

Historical Account of the Warrington Academy.

[Continued from p. 231.]

During the interval between 1761 and 1767, the subscriptions originally promised being found to drop off gradually, partly, as Dr. Priestley states, (Life, p. 50,) in consequence of the unhappy differences between Dr. Taylor and the trustees, partly through the natural apathy of a great majority of the subscribers, who, having never had a regular account-current of the annual expenditure presented to them (such as is every year furnished to each subscriber by the accurate and indefatigable treasurer for the York Institution) had no distinct idea of the object for which they were subscribing, and, therefore, becoming weary of their subscription, were willing to lay hold of any pretence for dropping it, various expedients were resorted to by the trustees. In 1762, Mr. Seddon was commissioned to visit London, Bristol, Birmingham, and other places, in order to ascertain, by a personal application, how far the annual subscriptions were to be depended upon, and to endeavour to obtain new ones. This produced a temporary revival; but the regular, annual mode of distinct information of particulars continuing to be still neglected, the revival was only temporary. Another expedient was, to devise a means of increasing the number of students, particularly of lay-students, by accommodating those parents who injudiciously wished their children to resort to a place of education extremely unfit for them at so very early an age. For this purpose they tried the experiment, for a few years, of taking boys, under the age of fourteen, to be placed under the care of Mr. Benjamin Stapp, a divinity student of extraordinary promise; who, under the title of sub-tutor, was to train them in the Latin and Greek languages, and prepare them for the higher classes. They were also to be attended by a teacher of writing and arithmetic (a person of reputation in this line had, indeed, from the first, been engaged to attend for the accommodation of those young gentlemen who were intended for business). But after the experience of two or three years it was found, that the provision of a grammar-school for the elements of the learned languages had not been attended with the advantages expected. The discipline of a school and an academy,—that which must be exercised over mere boys, which, however founded upon the most ingenuous principles, must necessarily be, in a great degree, mechanical,—and that which is suited to the condition of more advanced youth, who, being arrived at a capacity of judging for themselves, are capable of understanding, and being regulated by, a system of rational and liberal restraint,—were found so incompatible, that this whole scheme was discontinued; and, in lieu of it, an attempt was made to provide further inducements to the parents of such young laymen as the institution originally contemplated, to send their sons to Warrington, by the appointment of a distinct professorship, to be held by a foreign gentleman, who should have the charge of teaching the principal modern languages.

In pursuance of this design, the trustees, on Dr. Priestley's leaving them, engaged Mr. John Reinhold Forster, a German scholar and turalist of considerable eminence,* recommended to them by Mr. Planta, Mr. Majendie and Mr. Woide, who undertook the charge of instructing the students in the modern languages, and also gave Lectures on Natural History. During his residence here, he published a Syllabus of Lectures on Mineralogy, which the present writer has heard well spoken of. But still the void occasioned by the loss of Dr. Priestley was by no means filled up, and a fourth professorship was out of the question. Dr. Aikin, therefore, was obliged to take the higher Greek and Latin classes, Mr. Forster, the junior ones, and Mr. Seddon, whose warm interest in the prosperity of the institution never deserted him, engaged to give Lectures on Grammar, Oratory, and History.

---

* Of this eminent person a very full account is given in the 4th v. of Aikin's General Biography, from which it appears, that he was born at Dirschaw on the 22d Dec. 1729, that after surmounting various obstacles, he attained considerable eminence in literature, studied theology, became a minister; but, having a strong *penchant* for some more general literary engagement, accepted an invitation to Russia; was disappointed (perhaps disappointed those who sent for him), was tossed about, and at last came into England on speculation, in 1766: his first engagement was at Warrington, where his

As this is the first occasion of his being connected with the Academy as a tutor, and as it pleased the Divine Providence that this connection should continue for little more than two years, the present seems the proper place for introducing any particulars which have been collected concerning him since the publication of the account of students educated by Dr. Rotheram, in your Repository, Vol. V. p. 428, 9.

Mr. Seddon was the son of the Rev. John Seddon (probably No. 182 in the list of students in Mr. Frankland's Academy, which he entered in 1691), who was first minister at Ormskirk, in Lancashire (where the subject of our memoir is supposed to have been born, and where he had some relations); he afterwards removed to the city of Hereford; where, probably, he continued till his death. The son, as we have seen, had his education for the ministry at Kendal and Glasgow; and, after he settled at Warrington, was unweariedly active in stirring up the opulent Dissenters at Manchester and Liverpool, to institute a plan of liberal education, till he was at length successful, as has been already related (p. 2). From its first establishment to his death he officiated as Secretary to the Trustees, and also as *Rector Academiæ*. In his former capacity he kept the minutes and accounts of the academy with great attention, carefully copying into them the several letters which he wrote to different gentlemen on the business of it (it would have thrown great light upon many of the transactions connected with it, if he had also inserted the letters which he received). In these and in the minutes, one sees his character very accurately drawn by himself; indefatigably active, warm-hearted, earnest, perfectly disinterested, not very patient of contradiction on subjects connected with this his favourite child, a little too fond of shew and parade, somewhat too meddling, and perhaps occasionally assuming, in

---

total want of economy rendered it impossible for the Trustees to keep him long; after which he tried various projects till his appointment to accompany Capt. Cooke (on his second voyage; previous to which the University of Oxford made him LL. D). His quarrels with the other literary men engaged for that voyage, are detailed in his and his son George's controversy with Mr. Wales, &c,; he returned to Germany, was made Professor of Natural History at Halle; and, after losing his son, died of chagrin and disappointment, in 1798, aged 69. Several of his works, particularly his "Observations on Natural History made in his Voyage," are of very considerable value.

his intercourse with the Tutors. This, however, does not appear to have produced any ill effects, excepting in the first instance: to which his great partiality for the Hutchesonian metaphysics, which Dr. Taylor greatly disliked, and his own dislike of the doctrine of atonement, under any modification,—above all, the aid he lent to the composition of the Liverpool Liturgy,* might also contribute not a little. But he was not a Socinian any more than Dr. Taylor, though Messrs. Bogue and Bennett, with their accustomed accuracy, bring this *heavy* charge against them both,† evidently confounding, in the former case, the two Seddons together.

Mr. Seddon was remarkably gentlemanlike and affable in his manners; and took great notice of the students, particularly those in the more advanced classes, by whom he was greatly beloved.—He had a very fine voice, and an animated, popular manner in the pulpit; which, in conjunction with the judicious instructions of Dr. Aikin, no doubt contributed greatly to the character for propriety and force of elocution by which the students educated at Warrington during that period were generally distinguished.

He married a lady, whose father had been Equerry to Frederick Prince of Wales, and who possessed a considerable fortune. But a great part of this having been lost in some unsuccessful speculations in cotton-printing works, established near Stockport by some relations of her's, he consented, after having given his services for many years to the institution, in his capacity of rector and secretary, to accept a small salary (£50) on becoming also a tutor. His Lectures on Oratory, and on Grammar, were prepared with great care, and heard with great attention and pleasure. A copy of both, in three 4to volumes, fairly written out by himself, was placed in the library after his death, and continues to form a part of the library at York.

The Institution had now the

---

* That he was *not* the author of the "Letter to a Dissenter," and that he had *no* wish to introduce a Liurgy *generally*, the present writer has obtained additional evidence. He never used any written notes in prayer. That in the new modelling of his chapel, his pulpit should be made with a reading desk, is no more a proof of the contrary, than that any secret intention of a similar kind should have been lurking in the minds of those who constructed the pulpits at Manchester, Chester, York, and most of our older places of worship.

† See Vol. III. p. 344. Mr. Seddon of Manchester, had no concern in the liturgy-controversy; and of Mr. Seddon of Warrington, who was the person to whom Mr. Orton wrote, as well as of his two colleagues, Dr. Priestley says, "We were all *Arians:* the only Socinian in the neighbourhood was Mr. Seddon of Manchester, and we all wondered at him." p. 48. In Vol. IV, p. 283. Dr. Taylor is represented as "abondoning the doctrine of Christ's deity and atonement for the cheerless system of Socinus." That he was no Socinian may be distinctly seen in what he says of the person of Christ in his Catechism.

Notwithstanding all its inaccuracies, however, and gross misrepresentations, the present author is disposed on the whole to thank Messrs. Bogue and Bennett for their "History of Dissenters." And he cannot but wish that every "wide," (p. 284) as well as narrow, Dissenter, would give it an attentive perusal. They might learn from it many salutary lessons. *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.*

prospect of possessing, for a considerable time, four persons well qualified, some of them eminently so, for discharging the duties of their respective departments. For the further accommodation of the students, who might naturally be expected to flow in from all quarters, the trustees determined to build a range of apartments, connecting the tutors' houses with the Common Hall, and forming altogether a quadrangle, having a handsome collegiate appearance. But what are the expectations and schemes of man! Scarcely had they accomplished one half of their plan, and thereby incurred a very considerable debt, than they found it prudent, and even necessary, to get rid of Mr. Forster; and a few months after, Jan. 22, 1770, a violent fever deprived his friends and the public at large of a man, whose robust constitution, uniform health, and great activity, promised a long continuance of useful services. His intimate friend and constant coadjutor as a trustee of the Warrington Academy, the Rev. Philip Holland, of Bolton, preached his funeral sermon, in which his whole character is drawn with such simplicity of truth, while the colouring is kept down with such a delicacy of friendship, as renders it an admirable model for discourses of this kind. Having been found by his nephews among his papers after his decease, it was thought by them, while engaged in the task of preparing his Posthumous Sermons for the press, that this would be an interesting appendage to his Sermon on the Importance of Learning, and his Character of the Christian Preacher. It is found in the 2d volume of that ill-fated publication, p. 197. The part which relates to Mr. Seddon's connection with the Academy will be no improper conclusion of this sketch; while the affectionate address to the students then at Warrington, may be read with advantage by other young persons, who may at any time or place be engaged in a course of academical instruction.

p. 209. "Every good man will feel a peculiar concern for the improvement and best interests of the rising generation. As a sincere friend to virtue and religion, it will naturally be his first and his last wish, that they may have the same influence over the minds of others, which they have over his own; and, in particular, that they may continue in the heart the great instruments of public and private happiness through all succeeding generations. For this reason he is extremely desirous that such methods of education should be encouraged and pursued, as may be likely to answer this purpose. This, one of the strongest presumptions of a good mind, was equally the character of our friend. He always discovered a particular regard for young persons, and had an uncommon facility in adapting his conversation to them in such a manner, as at the same time to conciliate their affections and promote their best improvement. You need not be told how great a share he had in the plan for the education of youth, which has been carried into execution in this place. The concern which he ever expressed for its support, honour, and success; the indefatigable pains which he took for that purpose, the indifference which he shewed to fame or censure, to good or evil report, so that he might serve the general designs of the institution; and the satisfaction which he discovered in every degree of success, with which it was attended; are known by great numbers; but by none better than those who shared his greatest intimacy, and were acquainted with all his counsels.

"On the same principle on which he was ever active to promote the best success of this seminary, he was at length prevailed upon to enter into the office of a tutor. That in this office he acquitted himself with great usefulness and acceptance, will be easily believed by all who knew him. The testimonies of those who attended upon his lectures, might, if necessary, be brought in confirmation of this assertion. He was not only the able instructor of his pupils, but their affectionate friend; and heartily desirous that, whilst under his care, and throughout the whole of life, they might behave in such a manner, as to be the joy of their friends, the delight of mankind, and secure their own highest happiness. These he professed to be his sentiments and views, as often as he spoke on this subject; and I have been frequently told, that every part of his conduct in this relation, was agreeable to them. So that I may venture to make the appeal to all, who attended on his instructions, whether he has not ever approved himself a wise, affectionate tutor? Has he not consulted your best improvement? Has he not shewn a peculiar affection and tenderness towards you? Though he was ever desirous to preserve that good order and decency of manners, which are peculiarly graceful in a young person, and which are so essential to the honour of such a seminary, yet he has ever wished and pleaded for such a discipline, as might leave room for the exercise of ingenuous dispositions, and prevent irregularities and crimes, rather from the shame with which the commission of them might be attended, than from any other consideration. What has been the success of this generous plan, which speaks such confidence in those whom it is intended to govern, we all wish to know; and I shall greatly rejoice, if, upon enquiry, it shall appear to have succeeded so well as to justify the propriety of it, and to recommend it to the imitation of all succeeding teachers.

"These, the more public virtues of our friend, though more conspicuous, were not his principal, nor, perhaps his justest excellencies. In the domestic character, and in his behaviour to his nearest relations, there was so much prudence, affection and tenderness, as could not fail of attracting their highest regard.—To his particular friends, too, he was peculiarly dear and useful. How engaging was his conversation; how wise and faithful his counsels! With what readiness did he enter into their laudable views; with what zeal did he seek their interests, defend their characters, and cherish their memories! But I forbear; a private loss ought not to be much insisted on, where the public are sufferers.

"It was his peculiar felicity, that his virtues were adorned with that easy politeness and graceful address, which procured him a general acceptance, wherever he appeared, and enabled him to engage great numbers, in different ranks of life, in those plans which he devised or encouraged for the benefit of mankind. In the conduct of those affairs, which he had to transact, he had a remarkable address in proposing what was to be done, with such clearness and accuracy, as conduced greatly to its dispatch and success. Hence, as well as on other accounts, he was uncommonly useful in the establishment and conduct of the academy in this place, and in other public designs in which he was engaged." p. 214.

P. 219. "It will not be un-unseasonable, I am persuaded, to add a short address to the students of this academy, with which our deceased friend was so nearly connected. Such is the experience which you have had, my young friends, of his tender affection, his wise advices, his faithful admonitions, that it may appear superfluous to call upon you to remember him. You will, I doubt not, recollect, with peculiar pleasure, his pleasing conversation, his engaging manners, and the unaffected concern which he ever expressed for your improvement and happiness. These are things which you will never forget, while any of the records of memory are preserved. As often, then, as you reflect upon them, you will, I trust, consider the use to which they should be applied by you, to form you to a worthy, honourable, conversation, to establish your virtuous purposes, and to train you up for that excellent course of life, which will insure your present and your everlasting happiness.

"It is with pleasure, but not without anxiety that the friends of virtue and religion turn their eyes on such a society as yours. They flatter themselves with hopes, that the candid manners and generous sentiments which they discover in you, at this early period, will produce the fair fruits of wisdom and virtue, in your more advanced years; that the course of studies in which you are engaged will enrich your minds with sentiments of prudence, integrity and devotion; that you will prove the honour and grace of your friends, useful members of society, and, in your several stations, the guardians of its best interests, and the distinguished ornaments of the Christian religion as long as you live. But at the same time, they cannot dismiss their fears, (and let it not offend you, my young friends, that they have their fears,) lest bad principles should infect your minds, lest the contagion of evil examples should rob you of your innocence; lest you should be seduced by the love of pleasure; lest you should be spoiled by a constant dissipation; lest you should go in those ways in which you will offend the Author of your being, and incur the danger of his everlasting displeasure. As the present occasion will naturally make you serious and thoughtful, let me persuade you not too hastily to dismiss the sentiments which it may suggest to your attention, and the resolutions which it may lead you to form. Consider what your late tutor, what your present tutors, what all the friends of virtue and religion, wish to see you; and, as a matter of infinitely greater importance, what the great Governor of the world expects from you, and the account which you must hereafter give of all your advantages, and of the purposes to which you have improved them. It was in part, at least, for your benefit, that the character of your late worthy tutor was so particularly laid open; and the means by which by which he was formed to that excellent character which was rendered conspicuous in so many instances during all the parts of his life, were mentioned, as a hint which you might possibly take, of the studies which you should pursue, and the purposes to which your knowledge and learning should be applied." P. 222.

V. F.

[To be continued.]

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. Belsham on the Controversy between Dr. Priestley and Bp. Horsley; in reply to the Strictures of the Rev. H. Horsley, on the Calm Inquiry.—Letter II.

Essex House, May 1, 1813.

SIR,

The right reverend and learned prelate, whose success in controversy with Dr. Priestley is so highly rated by those who do not understand the question, and so very moderately by those who do, after having charged Origen in his seventh Letter in reply to Dr. Priestley with " the allegation of a notorious falsehood," when " he alleges of the Hebrew Christians in general that they had not renounced the Mosaic law," which assertion served Origen " as an answer to the invective which Celsus had put in the mouth of a Jew," adds these remarkable words, which I hope that, for the edification of your readers, you will be pleased to print in capital letters. " THE ANSWER WAS NOT THE WORSE FOR WANTING TRUTH, IF HIS HEATHEN ANTAGONIST WAS NOT SUFFICIENTLY INFORMED TO DETECT THE FALSEHOOD." This, Sir, is the logic of a Christian divine, of a right reverend father in God, of a master in Israel, of the famous, and, as some say, the invincible advocate of orthodox truth, the boasted conqueror of the heresiarch Priestley, and if the testimony of the reverend prebendary is to be admitted, " a greater master than most men both of the Aristotelian and the Baconian logic." And the Reviewer of the controversy is to be held up to shame because, forsooth, he is no logician. No Sir, thank God, he is not a logician of the Horsleyan school. The Gamaliels, at whose feet he boasts to have received his humble portion of science, laid it down as a first and sacred principle, which admits of no exception, that truth is inviolable: that no sacrifice is too costly to be offered at the shrine of truth: but that to sacrifice truth to victory is base, is despicable, is immoral in the extreme.

The reverend prebendary, upon whom the bishop's mantle, though not his mitre, has fallen, dutifully undertakes to vindicate his father's logic and his father's fame; and, occasionally, to illustrate the prelate's rules by his own instructive example. Thus, presuming doubtless upon the ignorance of his readers, he ventures to allege, in p. 567 of his late publication, that "the object of Mr. Belsham seems to be to charge the bishop with taxing the veracity of Origen upon *every* question," whereas "the bishop's object was to tax the veracity of Origen in what he says *only* of the faith of the Hebrew Christians of his own time." To establish this allegation the reverend prebendary appeals to "no fewer than three sentences which all affect the question at issue of Origen's veracity," which Mr. B. has *prudently* omitted, and which the reverend prebendary has, with *equal prudence*, declined to produce. He charitably suggests the possibility of a culpable motive for Mr. B.'s conduct, but at the same time, with all Christian humility and in direct opposition to the blasphemous pretensions of the arrogant reviewer, he adds, "whether all this occurred to Mr. B.'s mind, and induced him to omit the sentences to which I allude, is unknown to me, *who possess not the faculty of discerning the secrets of other men's hearts.*" Determined, however, that Mr. B. shall gain as little as possible by this concession, he subjoins immediately, that Mr. B. "could not have acted otherwise than he has done, if it had occurred to him and influenced his conduct."

What those important sentences "no fewer than three," are, which Mr. B. and his reverend opponent have both so prudently omitted, Mr. B. knows not, nor does he think it worth his while to inquire, not thinking it necessary to cite every sentence which an author has written of whom he professes to give only an abridgment. All that he stated, and all that he intended to state, was, that the bishop had taxed Origen in his controversy with Celsus, with alleging a *notorious falsehood*. That a man who is guilty of wilful falsehood in one instance, will not hesitate in similar circumstances to renew the offence, and that, in such circumstances, his veracity is not to be depended upon, is a conclusion in which all are agreed. But that the most notorious liar should utter falsehoods upon "every question," and should speak nothing but untruths, is a supposition which no person in his senses will admit; even though they should not happen to be disciples of that philosophy which teaches that men are born with an instinct for speaking truth. It could not, therefore, be Mr. B.'s intention to insinuate that "the Bishop taxed the veracity of Origen on every question."

The reverend prebendary further states (p. 566) that "Dr. Horsley has actually *proved* that Origen's words will not admit of the sense in which Dr. Priestley has chosen to interpret them." It was therefore quite a work of supererogation to charge that eminent father with notorious falsehood, when in fact he had not made the assertion imputed to him. This the reverend prebendary admits; and expressly says, that the learned prelate "would probably not have made the concession, could he have foreseen the unfair advantage that was to be taken of it." That the bishop would not have been so ready to tax Origen with notorious falsehood, could he have foreseen that this charge would have terminated in his own discomfiture and disgrace, is a position which may command a ready assent. But that, if he had been quite satisfied with his own interpretation of Origen's words, he would gratuitously, and without any motive whatever, have stepped out of his way for the sole purpose of calumniating the character of one of the most respectable of the Christian fathers, by charging him with notorious falsehood in saying what he himself proved that he never did say, may possibly be believed by a pious and dutiful son, laudably jealous for his father's reputation, but he must excuse others, who may not be so deeply interested in the bishop's vindication, if they indulge a little scepticism in so extraordinary a case. That the bishop was not satisfied that his own interpretation was correct and that of Dr. Priestley erroneous, is evident from his own reluctant confession, "I give him Origen." — Remarks on Dr. P. Part 2. c. 2.

"The object of the bishop was to tax the veracity of Origen in what he says *only* of the faith of the Hebrew Christians of his own time." So saith the son and advocate of the learned prelate. But this is not the language of the prelate himself. It was it seems from Mosheim that the venerable dignitary "first learned to rate the testimony of Origen at its true value," but unfortunately, Mosheim did not supply him with the facts upon which that estimation was founded. Having however adopted the charge, he was compelled to find evidence to support it. And after all his laborious researches for this pious and charitable purpose, the learned prelate can discover only two passages in Origen's writings which are relevant to his object, and these are such as to a less willing or less perspicacious accuser would appear totally inadequate to establish so heavy a charge. I shall cite them in the bishop's own words, as they stand in the first chapter of the Second Part of the Remarks upon Dr. Priestley's Second Series of Letters.

Celsus, in his treatise against the Christians, introduces a Jew reproaching his countrymen for having deserted the law of their ancestors. "And how confusedly," says Origen in his reply, "does Celsus's Jew speak upon this subject, when he might have said more *plausibly*, *some* of you have have relinquished the old customs, upon pretence of expositions and allegories: *some* again, expounding as you call it spiritually, nevertheless observe the institutions of our ancestors: but *some*, not admitting these expositions, are willing to receive Jesus as the person foretold by the prophets, and to observe the law of Moses according to ancient customs." Here the bishop charges the learned father with falsehood and self-contradiction in acknowledging the existence of a sect of Jews professing Christianity, who had relinquished the ceremonies of the law. Common readers, however, can only discover, that Origen declares that his opponent would have expressed himself more *plausibly*, if he had charged only a part of the Jewish believers, and not the whole body, with having deserted the law. In this they see nothing approaching to falsehood or contradiction. And yet upon this frivolous pretence, the right reverend prelate adopts the harsh language of

Mosheim, which he prints in *large capitals*:—"EGO HUIC TESTI, ETIAMSI JURATO, QUI TAM MANIFESTO FUMOS VENDIT, ME NON CREDITURUM ESSE CONFIRMO."

The second passage, alleged by the bishop, in confirmation of the charge against Origen, is, if possible, still less to the purpose. Referring to the text, Isaiah vii. 14. "Behold a virgin shall conceive," &c. Origen remarks, "the word *Alma*, which the LXX have translated into the word παρθενος (a virgin), but others νεανις (a young woman), is put too *as they say*, in Deuteronomy for a virgin." "What," says the bishop, after having cited this innocent passage, "was it unknown to the compiler of the Hexapla, what the reading of the Hebrew text in his own time was? If he knew that it was what he would have it thought to be, why does he seem to assert upon hearsay only? If he knew not, why did he not inform himself?" And without further ceremony, he again fulminates the terrible sentence of Mosheim, "EGO, HUIC TESTI, ETIAMSI JURATO, QUI TAM MANIFESTO FUMOS VENDIT, ME NON CREDITURUM ESSE CONFIRMO."

The reader is now qualified to judge, not only concerning the justice, but also the extent of the bishop's charge against Origen for his want of veracity. The good father, it seems, was a man whose testimony the venerable prelate would not trust, even upon oath. Nor does he confine himself to the simple question concerning "the faith of Hebrew believers, in Origen's own times."

But what says Mr. Prebendary Horsley to all this? I will cite his words, as they stand in p. 576 of his late publication. Videlicet:—

"The character of Origen stands so high in the learned world, that he who should charge him with disregard to truth in general would *excite against himself the indignation of every man of letters.*"

This the reverend Prebendary calls vindicating his father's injured reputation. Surely, if the venerable prelate were permitted to utter a voice from the tomb, he would earnestly exclaim, "from such defenders, good Lord deliver us." And let all the friends and admirers of the pious prebendary say "Amen."

I am, Sir,
Your's, &c.
T. BELSHAM.

Mr. Sturch on the Dialogue on the Study of the Scriptures.

SIR, *March* 1*st*, 1813.

The anonymous author of a sort of dialogue between A. and B. inserted in your valuable miscellany, (p. 103.) published this day, in recommending so earnestly the study of the scriptures, is, no doubt, actuated by a very commendable desire to promote the best interests of your readers. I cannot help wishing, however, that he had confined himself to calm and sober reasoning, without attempting to work on our passions, and overwhelm our minds, by such terrifying phrases as "eternal misery," "eternal punishment," and "the wrath of God for all eternity." Such language, it is admitted, may powerfully affect the imagination, but is not likely, I think, to produce that salutary and permanent influence on the conduct, which is the proper and genuine effect of patient enquiry and rational conviction.

I should, also, have been better pleased with this writer, if after speaking of the scriptures in the highest terms, and of the absolute necessity of acting from the motive " which they prescribe, as the only one that will be accepted," he had not endeavoured to *coax* us, as it were, into the study of them, by assuring us, that *if they do no good they can do no harm.*" Really, Sir, if I were not afraid of giving a ludicrous turn to a grave subject, I should say, that this little artifice is not unlike that of the quack doctor, who assures us that his pills, besides being the only specific for all disorders, have the remarkable quality of being so *perfectly innocent*, that they may be taken without danger by an infant. One cannot help observing by the way, how widely this opinion differs from that of the opposers of the Bible Society, many of whom seem to regard the scriptures as one of those powerful medicines which may either *kill or cure*, and which, therefore, cannot be safely exhibited, except under the immediate direction of those regular professors of the art of saving souls, the divinely appointed clergy of the Established Church.

For my own part, I have no hesitation in saying, that if I had the honour of being acquainted with B. I would advise him not to be unreasonably alarmed by the denunciations of A. but honestly and manfully to make that use of his understanding for which it was bestowed on him by his benevolent Creator; namely, to exert it in the diligent acquisition of knowledge, with a view to practice; to make it the guide of his life, in his religious and moral conduct, as well as in his merely temporal concerns; and in so doing, to avail himself of all the assistance which he could derive from the wisdom and experience of others, both by conversation and by reading. Should he consult me on his choice of books, I would not fail to recommend the collection called the scriptures to his particular attention, as containing, (with other matter of inferior value,) a most valuable treasure of theological, moral and political science; but I would not advise him wholly to submit his understanding to any book whatever; because all books, without exception, having been written by men, women or children, are liable both to original error and subsequent corruption; whereas the human mind, being the immediate offspring of God, is and must be superior in dignity and authority to any human production.

My principal object, however, in this letter, is to take some notice of the important assertions of this writer, which are contained in the following quotation.—" Conscience did not teach the ancients that revenge was a crime; it would not have taught you so, unless your reason be stronger and more perfect than theirs, which you will scarcely affirm it to be. It is true you *do* know and acknowledge that revenge *is* a crime; but *how* do you know it? Through those very scriptures which you yet think not of the first moment. By *no other means*, through *no other channel, could the discovery be made; there is no other moral or religious code which holds the same doctrine.*"

I was on the point of calling these assertions *extraordinary;* but I correct myself; they are, in reality, too common. It is a prevailing opinion, that the poor heathen, whatever might be their ingenuity in other matters, knew nothing at all of religion or morals. This opinion has been confidently taught by some of the clergy, (happily not by all,) and seems to have been believed by the bulk of the laity, without enquiry. Dr. Watts has thought proper to versify this opinion, that it may be in the mouths of good Christians of all ranks;—

> **“ Let all the heathen writers join**
> **“ To form one perfect book,**
> **“ Great God, when once compared with thine,**
> **“ How mean their writings look!” &c.**

and the lowest maid-servant, having the doctor's authority, thinks herself entitled to sing these verses, to look with contempt on all that has been said or done by heathen moralists and to pronounce sentence of condemnation on their works, though she is so far from having the least acquaintance with any of their writings, that she is even perfectly ignorant of their very names.

But I have no difficulty in saying, because I am able to prove, that such assertions, as I have quoted from their anonymous author, are *the very reverse of the truth*. I affirm that the duty of forgiving injuries, or the unlawfulness of revenge, is agreeable to right reason, is a portion of the law of improved and cultivated nature, and was actually received and taught as such, before the Christian era, by those who had no other means of acquainting themselves with religious and moral truth than the exercise of their own faculties, assisted by the experience and observation of others.

I am happy, however to be relieved from the necessity of collecting the proof of this myself, by presenting to your readers a short extract from a valuable work of my late excellent friend, the Rev. Charles Bulkley; of whom I take this opportunity of saying, that in learning and ability he had few equals, and in piety and virtue no superior. But, I wish it to be understood, that I say this merely as a just tribute to his memory, and not with a view to create any prejudice in favour of his *opinions*. I rely entirely on the *evidence* which he has produced, which I take to be complete and decisive. His words are the following:—

“ Within the compass of natural religion are to be included all moral obligations whatsoever, relative either to God or man. As this is in the general acknowledged, it can be no way necessary to enter into any distinct or ample detail, for the proof of it. I shall, therefore only make a few remarks with regard to one or two particular virtues, that have been thought scarcely to be known among those of the heathen world. Some, for instance, have seemed to think that forgiveness of injuries is a moral duty, peculiar to the gospel. But it is *impossible* that it should be so, since there are, in fact, a great variety of plain and express passages in several heathen authors, who wrote before the time of our Saviour's appearance, some at the distance of several hundred years preceding that period, in which this duty is explicitly inculcated, and such a temper highly applauded. How finely, for example, is it expressed by Plato, at the end of the apology of Socrates. ‘‘ I am by no means angry,’ says the philosopher ‘ (ȣ̓ *πανυ χαλεπαίνω*) with my enemies, unless it be for thinking that they had it in their power to hurt me.' And in his Crito, it is in so many words insisted upon, in opposition to the too general sentiment, or at least perverse inclination of mankind, *ὡς ὁι πολλοὶ ὀίονται—ὡς ὁι πολλοί φασι* "that we are by no means to do an injury, no, not even in revenge, for having received one." With Aristotle it is an amiable and a manly character, to be no rememberer of injuries, *μη μνησικακος* but *ἐυκαταλλάκο͂ς* easily reconcileable and forgiving.' It is mentioned by Nepos, to the honour of Epaminondas, "that he never remembered an injury or an affront." 'Nullam adhibuit memoriam contumeliæ.' His character of Atticus has the same eulogium:—'Neque si quam injuriam acceperat, non malebat oblivisci quam ulcisci.' "He never received an injury, but he strove rather to forget than to revenge it." And the very basis and fundamental sentiment in Cicero's celebrated oration *pro Ligario*, is the excellence of this virtue; as he himself observes at the beginning of it. 'Omnis oratio ad misericordiam tuam conferenda est.'" *Bulkley's Economy of the Gospel*, p. 8, 9, 10.

Although this extract appears to me to be abundantly sufficient to set the question at rest, and I trust will convince the anonymous writer of his error, yet I beg leave to add one more quotation from Cicero, on account of its transcendant excellence, and truly Christian spirit.—"Nec vero audiendi, qui graviter irascendum inimicis putabunt, idque magnanimi et fortis viri esse censebunt: nihil enim laudabilius, nihil magno et præclaro viro dignius, quam placabilitate atque clementia." "Nor are those to be listened to, who think it right to be greatly offended even with our enemies; and who consider this as a proof of courage and magnanimity: for nothing is more laudable, nothing more worthy of a great and eminent character, than placability and clemency." De Offic. lib. i.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
WILLIAM STURCH.

Lord Bolingbroke and Mr. Whitfield.

SIR, *April* 10, 1813.

Although Lord Bolingbroke is styled, with truth, "a mighty champion of infidelity,"* uninformed writers have sometimes quoted him by way of authority, for what are erroneously denominated "the doctrines of grace:" He is said to have declared that the Calvinistic scheme is the only consistent system of Christianity, and to have thanked Mr. Whitfield, after hearing him preach, for "having done great justice to the divine attributes." What this nobleman thought of the divine attributes," your readers may collect from his Posthumous Works, (vol. iii. iv. v.) from Leland's View of Deistical Writers, (Letter xxiii) from some admirable reasoning of Gray's (the well known poet,)† and from Sykes on the Epistle to the Hebrews.‡ It was his lordship's belief *that we have no adequate ideas of the goodness and equity of God, as we have of his natural attributes, his wisdom and power.* In short, he judged fit to attack the moral excellencies of the Deity.

What fact can be a stronger

---

* See Monthly Repository, vol. viii. 203.

† Memoirs by Mason, Letter 31.

‡ Introduction, § v.

condemnation of Calvinism than *this*, which has been appealed to with so much triumph! The coincidence of reputed orthodoxy with the sentiments of a philosopher who was nearly atheistical!

I am, Sir,
Yours, &c.
N.

Methodist Excommunication at Falmouth.

Sir,

I now send you a brief narrative of the proceedings of Messrs. Seckerson and Co. at Falmouth, which I hope will be inserted in the Monthly Repository, for the inspection of the friends of religious liberty.

I informed you in my last (vol. vii. p. 650,) that Mr. S. said he was determined to act at Falmouth in the same way he had done at Flushing; accordingly, six weeks after the methodistical expulsion at Flushing, he, with Mr. Riles, chairman of this district, came to Falmouth to excommunicate the heretics. After Mr. Riles had preached, the Stewards, Leaders and Trustees were requested to stop:—Mr. R. then proposed the following questions, ‘ Do you believe in the true and proper Deity of Christ?’—‘ Do you believe in the doctrine of original Sin?’ &c. If I were to record the different replies which were made, this letter would swell to a pamphlet: by your permission, Mr. Editor, I will mention a remark of friend Johns’, which I think ought to be inserted in the History of Cornwall, and handed down to generations yet unborn.—“ I am a freeborn son of England, and a freeborn son of God also; I shall think as freely as I breath, and shall not be shackled by you, Sir, nor any man under heaven.”—This bold spirited reply was deemed so insulting to Mr R. that he would not suffer him to speak any more for the evening, and he was actually disowned for this only, for he was told the next day, if he would apologize for his conduct to Mr. R. he might still continue a leader in their society; but he chose rather to suffer affliction with his despised persecuted brethren, than to enjoy the pleasure of reputed orthodoxy for a season.

Mr. Philp, who has been a member of the society for near thirty years, and a Steward, Leader Trustee and local preacher for a great part of that time, in a very judicious manner, proved to a demonstration, that the proceedings of Messrs. R. and S. were inconsistent with the rules of the society, the writings of the great founders of Methodism, and perfectly antiscriptural and unreasonable.—It seemed as if they felt the force of Mr. P.’s reasoning, for they could not tell how to decide.

Near the conclusion of this affair, Mr. S., addressing Mr. ——, said “ I think you had better go to prayer and finish:” “ Really, Sir, said Mr. R. I don’t know what to pray for, I have not been in a meeting of this kind before, and I hope I never shall again:” however, some time after, the good man recovered from his dilemma, and prayed that *truth* might universally prevail. As soon as prayer was ended, and the people were retiring, Mr. S. arose and said, “ he should not consider Messrs. Philps, Mitchell, Johns, &c. as *officers* in the church,” and consequently, Mr. Editor, they were degraded to the *ranks*.

It is with unspeakable satisfaction, I inform you, that we can now muster about thirty sticklers for the divine Unity, in this corner of the kingdom. We have opened two large rooms; one at Flushing, the other at Falmouth; the latter will hold about five hundred people, and is often crowded, for the purpose of worshipping Jehovah, the God of the universe, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the *only* proper object of religious adoration.

Messrs. Philp and Treleaven preach alternately; the latter, a popular local preacher among the Methodists, was expelled by Mr. S. merely because he expressed his disapprobation of Mr. S's conduct at Flushing and Falmouth; and furthermore, is actually expelled from his home, by his own mother. He has been a Sabellian (i. e. a Unitarian in a fog,) for some time, and appears now to be sincerely examining the evidences of what *we* call the doctrine of the gospel.

I am Yours, &c.
An Enemy to Popery,
THOMAS PROUT.

Musical Taste.

Sir, *Nov.* 22, 1812.

You recollect, I dare say, what evil propensities one of our dramatic poets has attributed to

The man who has not music in his soul;

yet I never supposed, till lately, that a taste for the charms of music had been ranked among the signs of *grace*. Such, however, appears to have been the fact, if we may depend on the historical accuracy of *Sir W. Temple*, whose Essay *Upon Poetry* I have just read. At the close of the Essay he has the following passage:

"I know very well that many who pretend to be wise, by the forms of being grave, are apt to despise both poetry and music, as toys and trifles, too light for the use and entertainment of serious men. But whoever find themselves wholly insensible to these charms, would, I think, do well to keep their own counsel, for fear of reproaching their own temper, and bringing the goodness of their natures, if not of their understandings into question. It may be thought, at least, an ill sign, if not an ill constitution, since *some of the fathers went so far as to esteem the love of music a sign of predestination, as a thing divine and reserved for the felicities of heaven itself.*"

I wish any of your readers, conversant with the writings of the fathers, would give the *authority* to which Sir W. Temple here refers. Watts seems to have indulged the same speculation, when he composed the following stanza;

My willing soul would stay
In such a frame as this,
And sit and sing herself away
To everlasting bliss.

The professors of *the Sister Arts of Paint and Verse* have been equally fond of this idea. I have often seen a picture of *the Flight into Egypt*, in which the notion is carried very far. Several angels are represented as paying their vocal homage to the fugitives, each with a music-book in his hands.

OTIOSUS.

On Death-bed Repentance.

SIR,

I shall thank you for an opportunity of calling the attention of your readers to what appears to me one of the great evils of the present day, one principal source of its vices and crimes; and this is, the notion which appears so generally to prevail in all ranks, and almost universally in the lower, that a few days or hours of prayer and contrition, before death, may put the most atrocious sinner upon a complete level, with regard to future hopes and expectations, with the man, who, from his youth up, has sincerely endeavoured to conform his will and ways to the written word of God. I do not pretend to be a deep casuist in theology, but am fully persuaded that this cannot be a scriptural doctrine, when I witness its baneful effects upon my fellow creatures. Judging it by the sure criterion which Christ himself hath given us, "By their *fruits* ye shall know them," it surely falls to the ground; nor can it be reconciled to the frequent and unequivocal declarations contained in the sacred writings, that every one will be finally rewarded or punished "according to his works."

The belief that an infinitely powerful and good God will condemn any creature to exist in never-ending torments, is too horrible, too irrational, and too contrary to and subversive of the most glorious of his attributes, to be, in these times, generally held by thinking men, though it is countenanced by many, as a useful check upon the evil propensities of the vulgar. Falsehood, however, never was, nor ever can be, useful to a good cause; and whatever benefit the supporters of what may well be termed a system of terror, may hope to arise from it, is most effectually done away by the easy mode, which is now so generally looked forward to, of escaping any punishment at all. That the infinite mercy of the Creator will be extended to every thing that he hath made, is a prime article in my creed; but to suppose that by a sort of theological legerdemain, of which those who call themselves evangelical ministers are universally possessed, men of the worst description, the open profligate, the artful hypocrite, the base deceiver, the midnight robber, the cruel murderer;—to suppose that a man, who for years has been plunged deep in the pit of vice, may, by the help of the chaplain of the jail, or the person who is called upon to attend his sick bed, in the course of a few days or hours, be brought into a state which will entitle him to the blissful welcome promised to the "good and faithful servant," is what I think no rational Christian can believe.

I would be far from discouraging all possible efforts to bring sinners to repentance, even at their latest hour; and the more guilty they have been, the more strenuous these efforts ought to be: for every good idea that can be implanted, and every evil one which can be rooted out, is a step towards light and blessedness, from darkness and condemnation; but let us be careful that our desire to ease the mind of the sick or condemned man, and to magnify what we call the mercy of God, does not lead us to flatter him with false hopes. The apostle pronounces "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man who doeth evil;" but modern divines have discovered, that by means of a panacea, administered within a few days or hours before death, the most depraved of men may throw aside all fears of a future judgment, and leave the world in perfect confidence of a blessed change; to the great *comfort* and *edification* of all who witness his happy end, as it assures them that the work of repentance requires little time or labour, and consequently that they need not be in haste to give up their darling sins, in order to set about it.

The commonly received notion, that there are two places appointed for the final destination of the whole human race, one of exquisite and never-ending felicity, and the other of eternally-enduring torments, is still encouraged by many who cannot be supposed themselves literally to believe a doctrine so contrary to all our ideas of retributive justice. Which of us, on leaving this world, can hope, without a miracle, to be immediately fitted for the first, and what finite offender can deserve the last; indeed, to suppose either of these extremes, would be to deny that *any man* will be dealt with *according* to his works. The animating assurances which we have of the infinite love and goodness of our heavenly Father, may lead us to indulge the most sublime and glorious hopes of what may be attained by his true worshippers, in the course of that eternity which the resurrection will open to their view: but no man can look to his Maker, even as a *just* being, who believes him capable of consigning a part of his creatures, his erring children, to exquisite and never-ending torments. If we for a moment suppose this to be the mind and intention of God, how different, how *opposite* is it to that of his beloved Son, who, in his last agonies, besought forgiveness for his cruel murderers; and knowing "what was in man," urged their ignorance in extenuation of their crimes. Supposing this, how different, how opposite are they, whom the scriptures pronounce to be *one!* But though it appears to me little less than blasphemy thus to deny that God is just and merciful, I am fully persuaded that he will give to every one "*according* to his works," and "by no means let the wicked go unpunished."

Recent circumstances have forcibly led me into these considerations. On visiting a poor neighbour, who had two daughters living in a discreditable manner in her house, and urging the necessity of a change in their conduct, if they hoped for salvation, I was seriously answered by the mother, that "God loved sinners, and could save the greatest as easily as the least, and perhaps would save them sooner than those who thought themselves righteous." I was both shocked and astonished, and asked her, if God was thus favourable to the wicked, why the rich man in the parable was described to be, after death, in a place of torment? She instantly replied, "Because he did not *call upon the Lord* to save him." How, according to the present style of teaching and preaching, are such sentiments and opinions to be eradicated? And while they prevail, how is the religion of Christ to "take away the sins of the world?"

Another instance, proving the same thing, occurred soon after, when calling upon a poor man who was ill, a recent bad action of a very profligate person in the village happened to be mentioned, and I said, "What will he do, when he comes to your condition?" "O, when it comes to that, he will repent," was the answer that he made me: and thus, I believe, it will pretty generally be found, that few are deterred from evil by any strong apprehensions of future punishment.

What contributes greatly to spread this fatal delusion, is the frequent accounts we see in the public papers of the happy and even triumphant deaths of men with hands yet red with the blood of their fellow creatures. A most *atrocious* murderer was, some months ago, executed within a few miles of my place of abode, who, on ascending the scaffold, declared it to be the happiest day of his life; that he was going to be ever with the Lord; and called upon the crowd below to join him in a hymn of thanksgiving!! A short time before, I am shocked to say, *five* men were hanged upon the same spot for a burglary; and it was commonly reported, and I believe with truth, that the chaplain boasted of the pleasure he had experienced in attending upon them; as "though they had led the *wickedest of lives*, they died the *best of Christians*." I heard this repeated in a pretty large company, and no one expressed the least degree of disapprobation. This is certainly giving all possible encouragement to crimes; I had almost said, it is holding out the kingdom of heaven as a premium for their commission, and pointing to the gallows as the open gate through which we may pass to immediate possession.

By thus grossly perverting the heart-cheering doctrine of mercy and forgiveness to the truly penitent, we lose the two great restraints upon the violent passions of men, the two principal incitements to a holy and virtuous life, *hope* and *fear*. Notwithstanding the numerous and plain declarations of scripture to the contrary, we are taught that happiness may be attained and misery avoided, without the least regard being had to purity of heart or life. This fatal perversion of the truth counteracts, in a great degree, that powerful influence which the awful doctrine of a future just and merciful retribution must have upon the minds of believers, and accounts for the lukewarm insensibility of many, and the varied vices which infect, in different measures, so large a part of this enlightened and Christian nation. The terror of never-ending torments, and no lesser degrees of punishment are held out to the vulgar, like the written penalties of our own criminal code, is too severe and heavy for a just and merciful judge to execute; and men are encouraged to transgress by the hope, and even expectation, of complete impunity.

This idea, too, operates upon the minds of those who attend upon the vicious in their last hours: they cannot believe it possible that God, who is infinitely good, will condemn the poor creature before them to a destiny more inconceivably dreadful than can enter into the heart of man to imagine; therefore they not only soothe him with the hopes of pardon, but however detestable the habits of his past life have been, throw open the gates of heaven to his view, and bid him confidently look to entering in! The effect which a scene like this has upon the survivors who witness it, may readily be supposed. I have myself been present when the relatives of a man of the worst description, have immediately, on his death, felicitated themselves on his being gone to a state of everlasting blessedness.

I have said so much, Mr. Editor, hoping that some one of your correspondents will take up this important subject who is more able to do it justice, and remain, Sir, your obliged, humble servant,

M. H.

Quaker Doctrine of the Trinity.

West of England, 9th of 5 Mo. 1813.

Esteemed Friend,

I am induced to send thee a few remarks on a letter in thy last number, signed A. B. under the head of "The Quaker Doctrine of the Trinity." Thy insertion of that letter is a fresh proof of thy candid attention to all thy correspondents, who may think they have any claim to be heard in explanation. But when an individual writes on behalf of a whole society, who are mostly unacquainted with his name, his undertaking, and his knowledge, he had need to be careful as to what he advances. I give my unknown brother, A. B. some credit for good-will towards our Society, in supposing that he is clearing it from an unjust imputation, and vindicating its consistency.

He refers to a paper in a former number, wherein it is stated that "a member of our Society has been expelled for questioning the doctrine of the Trinity;" a charge which he would indirectly repel by shewing that we *disown* that doctrine. The instance of *expulsion* is too notorious to be mistaken, and (as many of us think) too arbitrary and unchristian to be justified. It doubtless alludes to that very respectable member of our Society, Thomas Foster; a man whose moral and religious claims to social regard stand in no need of encomium, and whose case, as stated by his own able pen, on the principles of Christian liberty, will probably be printed before these remarks can appear. To that important publication, therefore, I would wish to refer thy inquiring readers.

My present motive for writing is briefly to animadvert on what A. B. has said, respecting our Society, in allusion to the doctrine of the *Trinity*. He has rightly stated, that *we do not admit even the term, as being no where to be found in the scriptures,*—that *we have no Quaker creed*—and that *the Society, as a body, never pretended to interpret the scriptures.* The *first* of these assertions is undoubtedly conformable to the testimony of our best writers, ever since we became a people. We have been, till of late years, particularly careful to preclude, by this very argument, and by more copious reasoning, the idea of a *trinity of persons* in the Deity. We have deemed it a spurious innovation, of human invention, in the Christian religion. But though our modern Friends reject the *name*, they appear to countenance the *thing*. This was too evident to escape our friend Thomas Foster's notice: and under a sincere concern at the growing innovation, he laboured to convince his brethren of the inconsistency of it, and to guard the Society against its consequences. For this laudable conduct he has been most strangely *disowned* by the district meeting of which he was a member; not indeed on any specific charge, but on vague and ambiguous charges of *holding opinions inconsistent with those of his friends*; and *having become a member of another Society, &c.* When, in fact, he only became a common subscriber to the Christian Association for the distribution of religious books!

That the aforesaid symptom of our Society's declension from the principles of our forefathers, was apparent to others as well as to him, was but too true. I have to lament the fact. Within the last month, I have witnessed an instance of the public avowal of *Trinitarian* doctrine, by one of our most approved ministers, in these express words, at the conclusion of a prayer,—"Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three persons and one God!" Neither was this language *new* to me, though renewedly painful. Now, I would ask, What is this, but to proclaim the *Son* an object of worship, in common with our Father and his Father, and the *personality* of the *Holy Ghost?* What is it less than to proclaim explicitly, the doctrine of *a trinity of persons in the Godhead?* If this phraseology be allowable among Friends, what right have we to disclaim any longer the term *Trinity*, because not to be found in the scriptures? And if we have no *creed*, and have never pretended, as a body, to explain the scriptures, upon what warrantable ground can honest Thomas Foster stand *expelled?* If it could be any real or imaginary good to him, *not* to be separated from such a society, I should contend that his brethren can have no Christian right to hold him expelled. For it is a fact, that his only offence has, in substance, been his pleading the sound scriptural doctrine of the *worship of one God*, in opposition to a *Trinity*,—in agreement with his ancient Friends, "with the testimony of prophets and apostles,—and of Jesus Christ himself, the chief corner-stone *of the church of God.*"

I am, with all due respect,
Thy obliged Friend,
C. D.

Quaker Doctrine of the Trinity.

To the Editor.

Thy correspondent N. C. has furnished thy readers with a paper, said to contain the "Quaker doctrine of the Trinity," which is not, I believe, to be found in any of their accredited authors.

I send the following passages for the perusal of N. C. and such of thy readers as are desirous of gaining correct information of the belief of the Friends on this important article of Christian faith. They are extracted from Sewel's History of the Quakers, vol. ii. pages 497 and 499. The edition was printed in London, by William Phillips, in 1811.

The confession of faith from which these paragraphs are taken was published in London, on behalf of the Society, in 1693.

"We sincerely profess faith in God by his only begotten Son Jesus Christ, as being our light and life, our only way to the Father, and also our only mediator and advocate with the Father.

"That God created all things,

he made the worlds by his Son Jesus Christ, as being that powerful and living Word of God by whom all things were made; and that the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit are one, in Divine Being inseparable; one true, living, and eternal God, blessed for ever.

"Yet that this Word, or Son of God, in the fulness of time, took flesh, became perfect man, according to the flesh, descended and came of the seed of Abraham and David, but was miraculously conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary. And also farther, declared powerfully to be the Son of God, according to the spirit of sanctification, by the resurrection from the dead.

"That the gospel of grace should be preached in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, being one in power, wisdom, and goodness, and indivisible (or not to be divided) in the great work of man's salvation.

"We sincerely confess (and believe in) Jesus Christ, both as he is true God and perfect man, and that he is the author of our living faith in the power and goodness of God, as manifested in his Son Jesus Christ, and by his own blessed Spirit (or Divine unction) revealed in us, whereby we inwardly feel and taste of his goodness, life and virtue; so as our souls live and prosper by and in him. And the inward sense of this divine power of Christ, and faith in the same, and the inward experience is absolutely necessary to make a true, sincere, and perfect Christian in spirit and life.

"That divine honour and worship is due to the Son of God; and that he is, in true faith, to be prayed unto, and the name of our Lord Jesus Christ called upon (as the primitive Christians did) because of the glorious union or oneness of the Father and Son; and that we cannot acceptably offer up prayers and praises to God, nor receive a gracious answer or blessing from God, but in and through his dear Son Christ."

A. B.

Sketch of English Protestant Persecution.

LETTER VII.

Sir, *March* 11, 1813.

In a former letter I mentioned the difficulty of separating the influence of sincere, though mistaken religion from statecraft and priestcraft, in a farther inquiry after English Protestant Persecution. I am, however, disposed to make the attempt, resuming the subject at the death of Mary, who, in 1558, closed a short reign, religiously cruel and politically inglorious. With Queen Mary fell the Papal ascendancy in England. The Protestant policy which then prevailed has continued to our time, employing the faith, the forms and the officers of an established church to the various purposes of the state. These purposes have been by no means confined to the diffusion of moral and religious instruction. The clergy, whether Episcopal or Presbyterian, will be found, with exceptions eminent as they are uncommon, to have employed their influence to promote the changing and often discordant systems of civil policy, adopted by the rulers or administrations of their time. While their religious creed was settled for ages, without the toil of examination, and required only a subscription *ex animo*, their political creeds have been composed of *doctrines suited*

The monosyllable *job* has been of late changed into the polysyllable *compensation,* and as the name is changed, so many are contented to believe, is also the nature of things expressed by them, although identically the same. And on the whole, we conclude, that the *borough estate,* whether it be *Whig* or *Tory,* and it is composed of *both,* is, (considered as a party) adverse to reform, and scarcely reconciled to Catholic emancipation, as eventually inducing that general and radical reform, which both parties equally hate, however individual partizans may now and then squander a popular sentiment or two upon the subject. Mr. Ponsonby has done so; Mr. Plunket will do so; but a great people should be slow in their confidence, and cautiously discriminate in their effusions of gratitude, which often, meeting with future disappointment, brings the existence of such a thing as patriotism into doubt, when the sole fault lay in their own premature anticipations.

The man aloof from both parties, however inclined by personal affections to one of them; above the acceptance of transitory office; untainted by the habits and modes of thinking and acting incident to an ambitious and ambiguous profession, (the members of which are so often paid for making "the worse appear the better reason," that they lose by degrees the fine *tact* of morality, and substitute in its place a callous palm, a capacious pocket, anda distensible conscience;) enjoying a complete independence of fortune, always referable to the gratitude of his country: having lived so long as to lay up a rich accumulation, and bank of character; and now too old ever to have the inclination, or (such is the influence of virtuous habit) to have the *power* of deviating from the glorious consistency and unity of that character: this is the man in whom we place our unbounded confidence, and on whose honoured head we presume reverently to cast our leaf of laurel. This man is—HENRY GRATTAN.

Dr. Priestley's Works.

March 24, 1813.

MR. EDITOR,

The propriety of printing an uniform edition of the invaluable works of the late Dr. Priestley, having been suggested in the 6th volume of your Repository, and as most of them are out of print, or else become exceedingly scarce, I and several of my acquaintance have long anxiously anticipated the appearance of an advertisement to that effect. The rapid increase of Unitarianism, of late years, and the spirit of inquiry into the principles of rational Christianity, which begins every where to prevail, call aloud for such a publication. It would prove a great acquisition to the congregational libraries, established in different parts of the country; and hundreds of persons who are eager to read what the doctor has given to the world, but who are now prevented, some on account of a scarcity of copies, and others by the great expence of purchasing whole sets at one time, would then be easily accommodated. If a new edition were determined on, and a volume published every two months, or two volumes in a quarter of a year, and so on till the whole be completed, they would then come within the reach of all classes of persons, who might feel inclined to become subscribers. As there are many persons partial to the doctor's theological works, and those on collateral topics, who do not feel an equal interest in such as are on *scientific* subjects, perhaps it would be the better way to form an arrangement, so that the scientific ones should come last, and in such a manner that the subscribers might be at liberty either to take or omit them.

I wish very much to call the attention of Unitarians to the execution of this important publication, as it will not only tend materially to promote the extension of knowledge and virtue, but also to raise a durable monument of their affection and regard to the memory of the indefatigable, learned and pious author.

Humbly praying that the wise and benevolent Ruler of the Universe may send forth an ample supply of such faithful and disinterested labourers into his harvest, as was Dr. Priestley, I remain, Sir, with my best wishes for the progressive popularity of your excellent Repository,

Yours, &c.
GAIUS.

Extracts of Letters from the late Rev. B. Davies.

SIR,

As the duty of Unitarian Ministers boldly to state and defend their sentiments, has been often discussed, it may not be unacceptable to many of your readers to have the following thoughts on the subject, which I extract from a letter received from the late Rev. B. Davies, of Evesham, upon his opinion and advice being asked about the propriety of a young Unitarian minister dwelling often on his peculiar tenets.

"I am extremely glad to find that * * * * * is sound in the faith, and I cannot be displeased at his zeal for the propagation of his apostolic creed. He is not ignorant, I am confident, of the efficacy of good principles thoroughly understood, deeply imbibed, and carefully cherished, to promote the melioration of the heart, and the direction of the conduct,—in warm, but rational devotion, in an exemplarity of life, free on the one hand from any degree of laxity, and on the other, from any *unnecessary* stiffness, or its frequent concomitant, a proud ostentation of sanctity, which is the odious badge of many enthusiastic sects in our day. But the point I had immediately in view, was to express my thoughts respecting the propriety of his expressing his zeal warmly and frequently in defence of his doctrines. His conduct in this respect must be modified by many complex considerations, as his talents, his audience, and connections, and the probability of making favourable impressions: he must follow his own well-informed conviction as to the mode of uniting the wisdom of the serpent with the innocence of the dove. The latter, I am glad to infer from your account, he is in no great danger to sacrifice to the former. In some cases, silence is criminal, but a sincere declaration can at the worst be deemed only imprudent. But a seasonable declaration, *Oh! how good a thing it is!* when coming from a respectable quarter, and verified by powerful arguments. Will it throw any light upon this subject, if I mention two modern divines *only*, of of the same *orthodox* sentiments, but widely different in their manner of divulging them, and at the same time men of equal integrity: the one Dr. Lardner, who seemed to have been forced by his conviction of duty, notwithstanding his aversion to controversy, to deliver the truth. He has been honoured by all parties of divines, the highest dignitaries of the church, and deists too, with the appellation of the learned and *candid* Dr. Lardner. There the matter rested. He was so oily and smooth, that nobody thought himself hurt by his heretical principles, as they would call them,—and what converts did he make among churchmen, who universally extolled him, except among a few thinking persons, who were generally as cautious as himself? The other is Dr. Priestley, who was perhaps equally the mild, and I will add, in the essential sense of the word, the *candid* Christian. But when he appeared with the zeal and intrepidity of an apostle, people cried out, they that turn the world upside down, are come amongst us; the corrupt church trembled for its foundation, and thousands took the alarm; and a glorious list is upon record, and continually increasing, of many noble Bereans, who deserted their sanctuary, which they saw was polluted with Popish idols. Truth claims the field of discussion only,—in this field alone has she obtained her never-fading laurels,—this she courts and no other among rational beings. Let * * * * * * and * * * * * * * fight under her banners with their affectionate, &c.

March 1st, 1809. B. D.

Not altogether unconnected with the above subject is the following extract from a letter received from the same, upon sending him an account of the Unitarian Fund dinner, 1809; and you may perhaps not deem it unworthy a place in your valuable miscellany.

"I partook of the feast in some measure with you. No cause will ever flourish without zeal and union, which I rejoice to see adopted for the spread of Unitarianism. What wonderful effects have these means produced in promoting Methodism! It threatens to overthrow all other *isms* in the nation, from its adaptation to the prepossessions, ignorance and passions of the lower class, which forms the largest portion of all people. It is remarkable, that Unitarianism takes root principally among the great, the liberal, the learned and the inquisitive; and Methodism among the uninformed. Besides, the methodistic cause is favoured not a little among some of the higher classes, by the jesuitical pretence of an adherence to the established church, which throws off the odium of dissent, and leaves the door open to their admission to all places under government. We may however augur upon good grounds the final triumph of the truth of Unitarian Christianity. Growing information has hitherto ameliorated society, and been gradually, though slowly, effectual in expelling civil barbarism from the earth, and who can doubt but it will be progressive in its march. It is to a few select champions, that we are indebted for emancipation from the slavery of the dark ages, whose spirit was caught by others, and posterity will be equally indebted to the two great theological champions whom you commemorated, (Priestley and Lindsey) and other kindred souls, for emancipation from superstitious ignorance"

Your's,

A Constant Reader.

Objections to the Unitarian Fund.

March 1, 1813.

Sir,

After a deliberate inquiry, in which I can truly say, that I was actuated solely by a desire to discover the truth, at the age of twenty-five I became a decided Unitarian; and in consequence, considered it as an imperative duty to secede from the Church of England, in which I had been educated, openly to profess the principles I had adopted, and to defend and promulgate them on all proper occasions. But as I always thought a liturgy, with which the congregation was previously acquainted, and in which they could occasionally join, highly expedient, if not essential to the due performance of public worship, and admired the affecting simplicity, piety and sublimity of much of the church service, I separated from its communion with regret: a regret, which was not diminished by the circumstance, that my nearest friends and connections were much hurt and displeased at the step I had taken.

With the sentiments of that apostolic man, the truly reverend Theophilus Lindsey, I entirely accorded. I had the happiness for many years to profit by his ministry, and to enjoy his friendship, which I shall ever consider as a great privilege and honour. Wishing to promote the cause of genuine Christianity, I joined the Unitarian Book Society, and believe it has done much good. So far, therefore, I have withdrawn from the Church established. I find, however, that I shall not therefore be acknowledged as a genuine Dissenter by any class of Dissenters now existing. And if, as has been asserted by persons of high authority among them, the proper characteristic of a Dissenter is an aversion to, and condemnation of, not only the present establishment, but all national establishments of religion, whatever they may be, I freely declare, that I am no Dissenter in this sense of the word. With the government of the church, I do not think myself, in my private station, called upon or warranted to interfere, nor indeed to have any personal concern with it. My objections lie to the Trinitarian and Calvinistic tenets introduced into her forms and liturgy: were they removed, I could conscientiously return to her communion. For I cannot but regard the objections alleged by the old Puritans as very insufficient to warrant their separation; and that, while they laid a great and undue stress upon matters of little moment, they were themselves deeply involved in error and fanaticism, united with a want of charity, and the same disposition to persecute, when in power, which they so loudly complained of in their opponents.

It appeared to me necessary to say thus much by way of introduction. I now proceed to the purpose of my letter, which is, to explain the reasons that deter me, though a zealous Unitarian, from uniting myself to the Unitarian Fund Society, of which you are so warm and active a promoter: and I trust the candour and impartiality you profess will be evinced by admitting my letter into the Monthly Repository.

It seems to me that two sorts of ministers are requisite in the Christian church, whose provinces are different; and that excellence in both is seldom found in the same person. The first, men of study, well versed in the languages in which the scriptures are written, and in every thing that may tend to elucidate them. Upon their report the unlearned in those languages must depend. In cases where the learned are divided in their opinions, the unlearned must be doubtful; when the former generally concur in any interpretation the latter may be more confident. Another class of ministers is best adapted to convey religious instruction to the multitude; and may, as English scholars only, be very well-informed; be acquainted with the best commentators, and furnished with every other requisite for their office. Now I cannot conceive that the plan adopted by the Unitarian Fund Society, of teaching a few persons something of Hebrew and Greek for a short time, can tend to any thing but to make them smatterers and pedants; full of a conceit of that sort of knowledge, without the reality; which, should it induce them to enter into contests with able adversaries, such contests may end in their confusion, and perhaps defection. No Sir, if the object of the Society be popular preaching, and the diffusion of genuine, rational Christianity among the people; let them employ discreet, virtuous and well-informed men, who have a true zeal; though their studies are confined to the English language, a very extensive field, and abounding in all useful knowledge.

The Society, as far as it has for its object the encouraging and supporting Unitarian congregations already formed, by presents of books, pecuniary assistance, and occasional visiting and preaching among them, thereby opening a communication and intercourse with them, and connecting them with the Society in London, has my approbation, and in this I earnestly wish them success. But I am not prepared to say the same of their sending missionaries to preach in market-places and carpenters' shops; and sending bell-men with hand-bills about a town to collect together people to hear them. This appears to have a tendency to stir up dissension, and even to endanger the public peace, which it is the magistrate's province to preserve. If it be said in answer, that our Lord and his apostles publicly taught in highways and market-places, I answer that they carried with them their credentials in the power of working miracles, which modern apostles, do not, I suppose, pretend to. I now proceed to consider, as connected with this sort of preaching, that declared hostility to the Church of England and all national establishments, so apparent in all the proceedings of the Society; which I must condemn, as both dangerous and unwarranted by reason or scripture. Into this error Dr. Priestley unhappily fell, which was the principal cause of his sufferings. I revere the memory of Dr. Priestley, and have a high esteem for the greater part of his various, ingenious, and valuable writings: but I blame him, inasmuch as I conceive, that had he steered clear of this point, he might, notwithstanding the freedom of his sentiments on other subjects, have remained in his country and among his friends to the day of his death unmolested. I hope his example will be an admonition to Unitarians to avoid any direct attack upon the national establishment, any further than is necessary in defending their own tenets, which are not connected with any form of public worship or church government: and still more, to avoid declarations against establishments in general, from which it may be inferred, that they do not desire the reformation, but the destruction of the church established. This must, in the opinion of a large portion of the community, rank them among the enemies of the state. The destruction of the establishment would probably make way for the predominance of a domineering, fanatical sect, whose principles incline them to persecution, of which Unitarians would be the first victims. And let me ask, while every congregation of Dissenters is left at liberty to choose their own faith and mode of worship, has not the legislature of the country an equal right to adopt that form of worship that appears to their combined wisdom to be the best adapted to the religious and moral instruction of the people committed to their charge?

If it be alleged, that it is hard the Dissenters should be compelled to pay for the established worship, while they support their own ministers, it may be answered, that it is no more than a reasonable tribute, since they differ from the majority of their countrymen: but in fact they do not pay for the established worship; the church is endowed with ample estates, which if they were properly and equitably applied, would be sufficient for its support. And the oppression of tythes might be removed by selling them, as the land-tax has been sold, and laying out the produce in land; or by converting them into corn-rents. For my part, I hold an established church, provided for by the state, without any distinction between Churchmen and Dissenters as to their admissibility to civil offices, which, in fact, amounts to nothing more than a public leading in religion, and a provision for the instruction of the great mass of the people, who, without it, would be in danger of losing all religious impressions,—to be very expedient and necessary: and that those who maintain the contrary opinion have a tendency, without perhaps knowing it, to fanaticism. I cannot but remark, and I do it with concern, that the Society, like most of the Dissenters, is very fond of extempore or, as they call it, free prayer. Now I conceive this to be a sort of Popery, compelling the congregation, if they will pray at all, to adopt the sentiments, and pray in the words of the minister, and that without examination; for if they stop to consider, they criticise instead of praying, and lose all devotion. To make this worse, the prayers are usually very long, and weary the attention, even when good. If they be written beforehand, which is better, they come nearer to a liturgy, but a liturgy that no one but the minister has read. A liturgy combines and unites a congregation, which otherwise has really no bond of union. If well-composed and approved by the congregation, they may all join in it with understanding and devotion, and individuals may apply it to their own particular cases.

Another objection to the conduct of the Society is a very important one. This is the uniting with their teaching of gospel truths, such as the Divine Unity and placability, several dogmas on dark, mysterious subjects, beyond the ken of mortals; to which, however, they seem to require assent, to round their system. Such, I mean, as the materiality of the human soul, and that it, together with the body, totally perishes and is dissolved at death. To decide such a point as this, concerning which we are wholly ignorant, seems very presumptuous, especially considering how many among the learned and the wise, philosophers and Christians, have thought and still think otherwise. It appears like a contradiction and impossibility, that when a being, like man, has been totally destroyed and mouldered into dust, he should, after many years, be revived, and be the same man, with the same thoughts and dispositions. A new man may be created; but how this new man can be the same as the old one seems to be incomprehensible. We firmly believe that we shall live in a future state, and be rewarded and punished according to our deeds done in the body; but of the manner in which this will be accomplished we are wholly ignorant; and it does not become any of us to dogmatise on the subject. We should

> "Wait the great teacher death, and
> God adore."

The doctrine of the necessity of human actions is another accessory, of a nature to alarm and perplex men even of sound understanding, and therefore very improper to be urged. To reconcile the divine prescience with the liberty of human actions is difficult; but the doctrine of necessity takes away all difference between right and wrong, vice and virtue. We all feel and believe, whatever the advocates for necessity may say to the contrary, that our actions are under our own guidance; that there is both vice and virtue; that they are most opposite to each other; and that all morality and religion are founded on this distinction. I must *act* upon this belief. Why, then, puzzle the understandings of men with attempts to explain what cannot be understood, and of which they who attempt to inform others are as ignorant as any among their hearers. The origin of the evil that abounds in the world, some also pretend to account for; but they leave us as much in the dark, on this difficult subject, as we were before.

Is the discussion of such dark and profound questions, which have foiled the sagacity of the greatest philosophers and the most learned and acute divines, before a mixed congregation, likely to be attended with any benefit to the hearers? Will it conduce to make men more just and honest, more sincerely pious and benevolent? Is it not rather likely to confound their understandings, or to produce general scepticism? Above all, does it become any men in their present state of ignorance, to be positive on such points, and to make them articles of faith?

Such, Sir, are the particulars in the conduct of the Unitarian Fund Society, which must, while they exist, keep me at a distance from it. Nevertheless, with sincere good-will, wishing them success in all that part of the design of which I have before expressed my approbation, I subscribe myself,

Yours,

X. X. A SECEDER.

JOHN MILTON.

Unus patronus bonæ causæ satis est.

EPISCOPIUS.

No. XXV.

Popular Preaching and Pulpit Training.

But here it will be readily objected, What if they who are to be instructed, be not able to maintain a minister, as in many villages? I answer, That the scripture shews in many places what ought to be done herein. First, I offer it to the reason of any man whether he think the knowledge of Christian religion harder than any other art or science to attain. I suppose he will grant, that it is far easier, both of itself, and in regard of God's assisting Spirit, not particularly promised us to the attainment of other knowledge, but of this only; since it was preached as well to the shepherds of Bethlehem by angels as to the Eastern wise men by that star; and our Saviour declares himself anointed to preach the gospel to the poor, Luke iv. 18. Then surely to their capacity. They who after him first taught it, were otherwise unlearned men; they who before Huss and Luther first reformed it, were for the meanness of their condition called, *The Poor Men of Lyons;* and in Flanders, at this day, *Les Gueus*, which is to say, *Beggars*. Therefore are the scriptures translated into every vulgar tongue, as being held in main matters of belief and salvation, plain and easy to the poorest; and such no less than their teachers, have the Spirit to guide them in all truth. *John* xiv. 26, and xvi. 13. Hence we may conclude, if men be not all their life-time under a teacher to learn logic, natural philosophy, ethics or mathematics, which are more difficult, that certainly it is not necessary to the attainment of Christian knowledge, that men should sit all their life long at the feet of a pulpited divine: while he, a lollard indeed over his elbow cushion, in almost the 7th part of 40 or 50 years, teaches them scarce half the principles of religion: and his sheep ofttimes sit the while to as little purpose of benefiting as the sheep in their pews at Smithfield; and for the most part, by some simony or other bought and sold like them; or, if this comparison be too low, like those women, 1 Tim. iii. 7. *ever learning and never attaining:* yet not so much through their own fault as through the unskilful and immethodical teaching of their pastor, teaching here and there at random, out of this or that text, as his ease or fancy, and ofttimes as his stealth guides him. Seeing then that Christian religion may be so easily attained, and by meanest capacities, it cannot be much difficult to find ways, both how the poor, yea all men, may be soon taught what is to be known of Christianity, and they who teach them recompensed. First, if ministers of their own accord, who pretend that they are called and sent to preach the gospel, those especially who have no particular flock, would imitate our Saviour and his disciples, who went preaching through the villages, not only through the cities, Matth. ix. 35. Mark vi. 6. Luke xiii. 22. Acts viii. 25, and there preached to the poor as well as to the rich, looking for no recompence but in heaven; John iv. 35, 36. *Look on the fields, for they are white already to harvest; and he that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal.* This was their wages. But they will soon reply, we ourselves have not wherewithal; who shall bear the charges of our journey? To whom it may as soon be answered, that, in likelihood, they are not poorer than they who did thus: and if they have not the same faith which those disciples had to trust in God and the promise of Christ for their maintenance as they did, and yet intrude into the ministry without any livelihood of their own, they cast themselves into a miserable hazard or temptation, and ofttimes into a more miserable necessity, either to starve or to please their paymasters rather than God: and give men just cause to suspect, that they came neither called nor sent from above to preach the word, but from below, by the instinct of their own hunger, *to the varying hour*. Of those doctrines, that of the civil magistrate's power of the sword in spirituals, they have always been among the first to assert and the latest to abandon. Nor, whatever pretensions may have been made, in this comparatively liberal age, can it be shewn, from any satisfactory evidence, that a Protestant, any more than a Papal, established church was ever tolerant till toleration had become the policy of the state.

The moral purity of Elizabeth's character, a favourite theme of her panegyrists, has been by historians justly disputed, nor has her religion been esteemed less problematical. The character of her sister is better ascertained. Mary appears in morals unexceptionable, but in religion a priest-led, persecuting Papist, who killed and thought she did God service. Elizabeth can scarcely be esteemed more than a *political* Protestant. During the reign of Mary she had temporized, according to her learned Annalist Camden, who says, "The lady Elizabeth now governing herself as it were a ship in stormy weather, both heard divine service after the Romish manner, and was often confessed; yea, at the rigorous instances and menaces of Cardinal Pole, professed herself, for fear of death, a Romish Catholic." (P. 9.) Osborn, who wrote his "Traditional Memoirs of the Reign of Elizabeth," by the help of information derived from personal intercourse with her courtiers, mentions her dislike of Luther, to whose memory the queen had an unappeasable feud, ever since he upbraided her father with the repudiation of Charles the Fifth's sister." He proceeds to describe the queen as "rather thrown, than of herself fallen, from the obedience of *Rome*." This opinion he deduces "from the *ceremonies* used at her *inauguration*, all purely *Catholic*, and the retention of the *ring*, *cross*, and *surplice*, contrary to the grain of her strongest assertors. From whence her aim may be guessed as not pointing at a greater dissent from the doctrine of *Rome* than her father's proceeding had chalked her out; commanding the *Common Prayer Book* (which contains most of the *Mass* in English) to be publicly read, and its opposers the *Brownists*, *Anabaptists*, *Family of Love*, with a number of other crawling errors, the unnatural heat of *Luther's* disputes had produced over all *Germany*, to be restrained under no slighter penalty than death or imprisonment." (Works, 1673, pp. 411, 12.)

It is certain that Elizabeth discovered no eagerness to abolish the ceremonies of Popery. Dr. Warner (Ecc. Hist. ii. 427) as quoted by Dr. Toulmin (Neale 1. 158) says, "When the Dean of St. Paul's, in a sermon at court, spoke with some dislike of the sign of the cross, her Majesty called aloud to him from her closet, commanding him to desist from that ungodly digression, and to return to his text. At another time, when one of her chaplains preached a sermon on Good Friday, in defence of the real presence, which, without guessing at her sentiments, he would scarcely have ventured on, she openly gave him thanks for his pains and piety." Burnet says, "The queen had been bred up from her infancy with a hatred of the Papacy and a love to the Reformation. But yet, as her first impressions, in her father's reign, were in favour of such old rites as he had still retained; so, in her own nature, she loved state and some magnificence in religion as well as in every thing else. She thought, that in her brother's reign they had stript it too much of external ornaments, and had made their doctrine too narrow in some points; therefore she intended to have some things explained in more general terms, that so all parties might be comprehended by them. She inclined to keep up images in churches; and to have the manner of Christ's presence in the sacrament left in some general words; that those who believed the corporal presence might not be driven away from the church by too nice an explanation of it." Burnet adds, with what justice I cannot perceive, " Nor did she like the title of *Supreme Head;* she thought it imported too great a power, and came too near that authority which Christ only had over the church." (Reform. ii. 348.) Dr. Warner remarks, with more probability, that " Elizabeth was not to be won with either threats or entreaties to part with her supremacy; of which she was as fond as the king her father." Dr. Toulmin well observes, that " to a woman of Queen Elizabeth's spirit, it was, independently of every religious consideration, a powerful inducement to support the Reformation." —(Neale, i. 124, 154.)

In your 7th Volume, p. 22, is quoted, from *Strype*, a curious Dialogue between Queen Elizabeth and Dean Nowell, on occasion of a pictured prayer-book presented by the dean to his royal mistress, as a new-year's gift. It is remarkable that such a present should have been contrived by the Dean of St. Paul's, who headed that part of the clergy, which, from their desire to carry further the reformation of Edward, were called Puritans. The Protestant indignation, expressed by the queen on that occasion, it is difficult to regard as any thing better than mere affectation, one example of the queen-craft in which she was no mean proficient. Strype dates this dialogue in 1561. Yet he mentions, under the year 1564, " an English Papist at Louvaine," who dedicated a work to the queen, declaring, " that her good affection to the Cross moved him to adventure to recommend this treatise to her highness." Strype refers this to the crucifix in the queen's chapel, which he evidently supposes, till that time at least, to be retained. Burnet, in his Collections (iii. 292—294) has preserved some curious particulars on this subject, in several Latin letters from Bishops Jewell and Sands to Peter Martyr, in 1559 and 1560. From these it appears, that the queen had in her chapel a crucifix, and proposed to retain such in churches, with images of Mary and John, conveniently placed so as to be seen by all the people. Sands expostulated, and was threatened with the queen's indignation. She however appears, at length, to have conceded some point, perhaps the public exposure of the crucifix, and she might discard Mary and John. Yet Sands complains that Popish vestments were retained. Burnet has also preserved (Rec. ii. 316) the following submissive language, used by " bishops and divines" on this occasion—" Not in any respect of self-will, stoutness, or striving against your Majesty, (God we take to witness) for with David we confess that we are but *canes mortui aut pulices*, [dead dogs or fleas] in comparison."

"Princes and statesmen, we know from numerous examples, will stand forth the champions of religion, when it neither warms their hearts nor is in any degree the impelling motive, even when the *form* they contend for looks most friendly to their interest." I borrow this remark from Dr. Brett, a Protestant divine of the Establishment in Ireland, and an early assertor of Catholic claims against the *Considerations* of Archdeacon Blackburne. Whatever were Elizabeth's real opinions in religion, if indeed she seriously entertained the subject, she soon determined that the Church of England should again become Protestant. The missal was once more exploded and the liturgy restored, to which it was enjoined on a whole people, immediately, at their peril, to return. Thus ignorant of the nature of religion, as a personal concern, or inattentive to its obligations, have been the Protestant, equally with the Papal maintainers of established churches. To expedite this return, a parliament was called, which, through courtly influence, consisted of members sufficiently obsequious to the wishes of the queen.

The first acts of this parliament put into the hands of Elizabeth two eminent *instruments of cruelty*, the statute "to restore to the crown the ancient jurisdiction over the estate ecclesiastical and spiritual," from which originated the court of High Commission, and the "Act for the uniformity of common prayer and service in the church, and administration of the sacraments."

In the preamble to the former of these statutes the parliament indulge a recollection most appropriate on such an occasion; for they remind the queen of her "most dear father, *of worthy memory*, King Henry the 8th." She is empowered to "assign commissioners to execute ecclesiastical jurisdiction,—to visit, reform, redress, order, correct and amend all such errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities whatsoever, which, by any manner of spiritual or ecclesiastical power, authority or jurisdiction, can or may lawfully be reformed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained or amended, to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue, and the conservation of the peace and unity of this realm." Heresy is described to be whatever is so adjudged "by the authority of the canonical scripture, or by the first four general councils, or such as shall hereafter be ordered, judged or determined to be heresy by the high court of parliament, with the assent of the clergy in convocation." This court of high commission, after having been the source of grievous oppressions, was suppressed, in the 16th year of Charles I. 1641.

The *Act of Uniformity* still remains, the disgrace of the Common Prayer Book, to which it is generally annexed. However solemn its phraseology, it is nothing better than a cruel mockery of the Christian liberty affected by Protestants, when they discarded the Pope. The clergy are forbidden to make the slightest alteration in the "*Book of Common Prayer and*

Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England, under the penalty, for a second offence, of suffering imprisonment during life." It may be said, that no one is compelled to be a clergyman, and whoever undertakes the office, should previously

> Weigh well the wages with the work assigned.

The act however proceeds to ordain, "that if *any person or persons whatsoever* shall, in any interludes, plays, songs, rhymes, or *by other open words*, declare or speak any thing in the derogation, depraving or despising of the same book, or of any thing therein contained, or any part thereof,—being thereof lawfully convicted, he shall forfeit to the queen for the first offence 100 marks, or be imprisoned six months; for the second 400 marks, or be imprisoned twelve months; and if convicted a third time, he shall forfeit to the queen all his goods and chattels, and shall suffer imprisonment during his life." It is further ordained, that "all and every person or persons, inhabiting within this realm or any other the Queen's Majesty's dominions, shall diligently and faithfully, having no lawful or reasonable excuse to be absent, endeavour themselves to resort to their parish church or chapel accustomed, or upon reasonable *let* thereof, to some usual place, where common prayer and such service of God shall be used in such time of *let* upon every Sunday and holyday,—upon pain of punishment by the censures of the church, and also upon pain that every person so offending shall forfeit, for every such offence, twelve pence, to be levied by the churchwardens of the parish where such offence shall be done, for the use of the poor of the same parish."

To enforce this system of *robbery for a burnt offering*, "the archbishops, bishops, and other ordinaries" are required "to endeavour themselves, to the utmost of their knowledge,—as they will answer before God for such evils and plagues, with which Almighty God may justly punish his people, for neglecting this good and wholesome law."

In conformity to these statutes among Queen Elizabeth's injunctions, 1559, are the following, (Wilkin Con. Mag. Brit. IV. 187.)

"31. That no man shall wilfully and obstinately defend, or maintain any errors, heresies, or false doctrines, contrary to the faith of Christ and his Holy Spirit.

"33. That no person shall, neglecting their own parish church, resort to any other church, in time of common prayer, or preaching, except it be by the occasion of some extraordinary sermon, in some parish of the same town."

Persecution, *unto death*, does not appear openly denounced in the acts and ordinances which I have quoted. Yet what has been observed of deposed princes, has been too often verified in the experience of those, whom priests and princes have agreed to persecute, that there is but a short distance between the prison and the grave. Besides, that the claims of royal ecclesiastical supremacy, and the authoritative definitions of heresy, became a fruitful source of capital delinquency. So false and even shameless was the compliment paid by Hollinshed to the government of Elizabeth, that "the furious firebrands of cruel persecution, which had consumed so many poor men's bodies, were now extinct and quenched." (Holl. III. 1181.)

Whether, as this *chronicler* adds, "All persecution now ceased," under "a governor that promoted liberty of conscience," I shall soon proceed to enquire.

R. G. S.

Catholic Bill.

(From the Belfast *Monthly Magazine*, April 30, 1813.)

From the great pressure of *other* public business which would not admit of postponement, the friends of the Catholic bill have determined not to introduce it into the House of Commons, until after the Easter recess. Ireland must give precedence to India. We shall not enter into the comparative importance of the two subjects. The interests of five millions at our doors are, perhaps, politically speaking, equiponderant to those of fifty millions on the other side of the globe; but there is an ignorant and intermeddling philanthropy much in vogue at present, which holds in paramount consideration the "inhuman" and "degrading" superstitions prevalent in the immense population of India, and anxious for nothing so much as to Christianize that whole population, contemplates with a calm indifference those "inhuman" and "degrading" distinctions which take place among our own people, and which may well be called *political superstitions*, even more detrimental than the religious, to the best interests of the British empire.

Patriotism is, in our minds, the only true, genuine, practical philanthropy; and one ounce of the former is of more sterling worth for all the uses and purposes of human life, than all that benevolent but abstract philosophy beaten into gold leaf, which shines on the surface of so many speeches and writings occupied with the propagation of Christianity among the heathen, deploring so bitterly the moral degradation of India, and at the same time careless about all moral melioration, either in law or policy, at home, or resisting it merely because it is an innovation. Thus, the burning of a Gentoo wife, or the exposure of infants, excites a paroxysm of horror among these philanthropists; but the sentence for treason, which orders the bowels to be taken out before the face of the criminal, or the law, which, by corruption of blood, punishes the innocent directly and voluntarily, and the guilty only from sympathy and attachment to those connected with them, these and similar *legislative* degradations which defile the statute book, and disgrace the moral character of the country, are cherished, with superstitious awe and irrational respect.

Infanticide! certainly a terrible crime in Ireland, as well as in India; but not seldom occasioned by the conflict of contending passions, shame, the fear of disgrace, the loss of character, abandonment, despair, the panic of the moment, the rashness of sudden terror, all motives tearing the heart, and blinding the intellect of the miserable mother, and generating that temporary madness which forgets the nearest and dearest feelings of human nature.

Infanticide! most certainly a terrible crime in India; yet it were to be wished that these philanthropists would cast their eyes over the history of the Foundling Hospital in Ireland, supported by such liberal grants of the public money. From the year 1785 to 1798, inclusive, in the course of thirteen years, 27,274 children were received, out of which number 13,120, or nearly one half, perished, and from the table shewing the number admitted from July 1797 to 1798, and the number of deaths, no less than 1,457 deaths out of 1,922 admitted, a result at which humanity must shudder. Since the new regulations, the mortality has been less, and an improvement has been effected in the management of the Institution, but the deaths among *the infants only*, from the year ending July 1799 to 1808, have been 5,043, out of 19,638.

O, let these philanthropists who are exporting their cargoes of fine feelings to India, condescend to look upon and examine thoroughly the whole *detail*, not only of the aforesaid infanticide establishment, but of many of our domestic state institutions, meant, no doubt, to alleviate, but which in reality have greatly aggravated the miseries of civilized mankind. Let them think less of reform abroad, and be more active about it at home, where it is not less wanted than in India. It will not be an easy matter to alter manners and customs of a thousand or two thousand years, by a missionary society; nor is it all likely that the sprinkling of a little water will make the Hindoo prefer the Jordan to the Ganges. The code of Menu, in addition to the general and indisputable equity of its civil ordinances, contains a sublime and amiable philosophy, founded on immemorial usage and patriarchal tradition. We have always considered the proselyting spirit as closely bordering upon the spirit of persecution. If any resistance be made to the self-sufficiency that says, you *must* take *my* way to heaven, it is not improbable that in the spleen of disappointment, it may deem you better fitted for *hell*, a word once more become the fashion, and sanctioned by the highest authorities, as the very bathos of *sublime* recrimination.

Well — "Inter ardua regni," India takes the lead of Ireland, and Ireland willingly yields the precedence. There is no hurry. After waiting for more than a century, it would be unreasonable not to protract patience for a fortnight. It is, we allow it, a most grave affair of state, marching, we trust, with slow but assured step, to its triumphant accomplishment. And we pray God, that, in this *sabbath of the year*, this recess, ordained by the religion of the state (as we suppose,) to awe or to allure the minds of men from selfish passions, and thus to give a salutary interruption and break to the continuity of worldly occupations, so apt to engross the whole human existence, we pray God, that those statesmen may employ this holy interval well in purging their minds from prejudice and suspicion, who are responsible to the whole empire for a final decision upon a subject so interesting to its present and ultimate welfare.

It has been reported that a disagreement prevails in the committee, between Mr. Grattan and Mr. Canning, with respect to several high offices, from which the latter would exclude the Catholics; loading, as it may be truly said, the bill with these exceptions, few in number, but material in effect. Conceiving, as we do, that Mr. Canning is prompt to set himself forward as successor to Mr. Pitt, in representing the Toryism of England, or the high-party of church or state, we judge the report to be extremely probable. We are not to estimate his abilities from his epitaph on Mr. Pitt, which certainly the stone-cutter might have performed as well as Mr. Canning has done; but his talents, like all bred in the same school, although of that ambiguous cast, and ambidextrous power which leaves you satisfied, or rather satiated with the orator, but most uncertain with respect to the *man*, are yet accounted such as qualify him to become the leader of the high church party, deserted as that party has been, in the present occasion, by the conciliating Lord Castlereagh. The Whig party, in both houses, seems to be dissolved into its original particles, indifferent to, and unsupported by the people. But, as we have before said, the people of England are in great proportion a *Tory* community; and those who, like Mr. Pitt and his pupils, have studied the dispositions of that people best, whether religious or political, without at the same time clearly manifesting their internal sentiments on a shining, ostentatious surface, ("nimium lubricus aspici,") those are the men, (not such men as Charles Fox,) who will, in longer or shorter time, manage to become prime ministers of Great Britain. In the mean while, they are willing to make use of the Catholic question as a stepping stone to political power, and to a sort of new-found popularity, awkwardly worn and ungraciously exercised.

Yet let no aid from any quarter be declined, for it is by such contributions, varying in degree and quantity, according to that measure of liberality which is bestowed upon each individual by nature, by reflection, by circumstance, or situation, by his hopes or his fears, his interest or his ambition, that the Catholic cause has been so far pushed forward. And in this *civil* concordat, in this novel treaty of amity and alliance between two portions of the same people; the one, with power on their side, and the other, only with justice; it well becomes the Protestant portion, who are to draw up the treaty, and to digest its articles, to have before their eyes and their memories, the infractions of the treaty of Limerick, which were made so soon after that most solemn agreement, when the letter of the national compact was gradually and yet not slowly destroyed and nullified, solely by *political power not having its due balance and equiponderance among all portions of the same people.* The consequence of this unjust distribution, beginning from the same hour, was the penal code; proscription; persecution; political disinction, generating every other distinction; and above all, and through all, a MORAL degradation, weakening and withering the national character, abroad and at home, and keeping *all ranks* of society in a state of semi-barbarism, while ferocious insolence and abject servility were diffused throughout the country, and often combined in the same individual: as in Egypt, none could aspire to become a *bey*, who had not formerly been a *slave*. We would then say, notwithstanding the great pressure of other business which does not admit of postponement, let the legislature of the empire make haste, as much as is reconcileable to the important business; make haste, we say, to atone to this much and long injured land, by large liberality and magnanimous policy, not in a compromising spirit, higgling and bargaining, as it were, in the market, but with a candid and confidential interchange of reciprocal rights and duties before the altar of the Most High.

The truth is, that the legislature must, in a great measure, instruct and lesson, and, as it were, *convert* the mass of the people in Great Britain, upon this question of vital policy, as well as vital Christianity, by the authority of reason, as well as by the enactment of law. We wish to think, that what is called the executive government, or at least, the influential portion of it, have preserved somewhat of an amicable neutrality upon the subject, in most parts of Britain, although with many exceptions. A singular exception of this kind has occurred, to illustrate the Isle of Wight, where a petition, sent for signature from *authority*, found only five or six, out of thirty-six clergymen, who could be induced to subscribe it; and even of those few, the greater part acted under controuling influence. We do the administration the credit to believe, that they are much more enlightened upon the expediency, and even pressing necessity of this great healing measure, than the borough aristocracy of the land, who are neither able nor willing to consider it in any other light than as an *innovation*. That is enough. It forms a precedent for reform. There is the rub. *That* it is, and chiefly, if not altogether, *that*, which agitates their secret souls, not from religious regards, however much they may *affect them*, to give the best colour to their resistance, but, really and truly, from fears, purely and personally selfish, respecting the sad consequences of new experiments, in the existing order of things, which they account excellent, and which, with the help of their good friends, the clergy, they would wish to be accounted too sacred for mortal touch.

But, like the court of East India Directors, they should consider how to yield up with the best grace *some part* of their monopoly, for yield they must; and if they could with any degree of decency, as borough proprietors, or corporators, apply for a *compensation* from government, for the injuries they are like to suffer through Catholic emancipation, these peculators of public weal, would no doubt present such a petition of claims to parliament, and remunerate themselves for the enfranchisement of a part, by a tax upon the whole of the people. By bills of *compensation* the resistance ready to start against the union, was kept down and muffled; and, perhaps, by other bills of *compensation*, this second edition of the union, improved and amended, is to be imposed upon the public.

to feed upon the church. Yet grant it needful to allow them both the charges of their journey and the hire of their labour, it will belong next to the charity of richer congregations, where most commonly they abound with teachers, to send some of their number to the villages round, as the apostles from Jerusalem sent Peter and John to the city and villages of Samaria, *Acts* viii. 14—25; or as the church at Jerusalem sent Barnabas to Antioch, ch. xi. 22, and other churches joining, sent Luke to travel with Paul, 2 Cor. viii. 19, though whether they had their charges borne by the church or no, it be not recorded. If it be objected that this itinerary preaching will not serve to plant the gospel in those places, unless they who are sent abide there some competent time; I answer, that if they stay there a year or two, which was the longest time usually stayed by the apostles in one place, it may suffice to teach them who will attend and learn, all the points of religion necessary to salvation: then sorting them into several congregations of a moderate number, out of the ablest and zealousest among them to create elders, who, exercising and requiring from themselves what they have learned, [for no learning is retained without constant exercise and methodical repetition,] may teach and govern the rest; and so exhorted to continue faithful and steadfast, they may securely be committed to the providence of God and the guidance of his Holy Spirit, till God may offer some opportunity to visit them again, and to confirm them; which when they have done, they have done as much as the apostles were wont to do in propagating the gospel, Acts xiv. 23. *And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they believed.* And in the same ch. vs. 21, 22. *When they had preached the gospel to the city, and had taught many, they returned again to Lystra and to Iconium and Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples and exhorting them to continue in the faith.* And ch. xv. 36. *Let us go again and visit our brethren.* And v. 41. *He went thorow Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches.* To these I might add other helps, which we enjoy now, to make more easy the attainment of Christian religion by the meanest,—the entire scripture translated into English, with plenty of notes; and somewhere or other, I trust, may be found some wholesome body of divinity, as they call it, without school-terms and metaphysical notions, which have obscured, rather than explained, our religion, and made it seem difficult without cause. Thus taught once for all, and thus now and then visited and confirmed, in the most destitute and poorest places of the land, under the government of their own elders, performing all ministerial offices among them, they may be trusted to meet and edify one another, whether in church or chapel, or, to save them the trudging of many miles thither, nearer home, though in a house or barn. For notwithstanding the gaudy superstition of some devoted still ignorantly to temples, we may be well assured that he who disdained not to be laid in a manger, disdains not to be preached in a barn; and that by such meetings as these, being indeed most apostolical and primitive, they will, in a short time, advance more in Christian knowledge and reformation of life, than by the many years preaching of such an incumbent, I may say, of such an incubus ofttimes, as will be meanly hired to abide long in those places. They have this left perhaps to object further, that to send thus and to maintain, though but for a year or two, ministers and teachers in several places, would prove chargeable to the churches, though in towns and cities round about. To whom again I answer, that it was not thought so by them who first thus propagated the gospel, though but few in number to us, and much less able to sustain the expence. Yet this expence would be much less than to hire incumbents, or rather incumbrances, for life-time; and a great means (which is the subject of this discourse) to diminish hirelings.

But be the expence less or more, if it be found burdensome to the churches, they have in this land an easy remedy in their recourse to the civil magistrate, who hath in his hands the disposal of no small revenues, left, perhaps, anciently to superstitious, but meant undoubtedly to good and best uses; and therefore, once made public, appliable by the magistrate to such uses as the church, or solid reason from whomsoever, shall convince him to think best. And those uses may be, no doubt, much rather than as glebes and augmentations are now bestowed, to grant such requests as these of the churches; or to erect, in greater number all over the land, schools, and competent libraries to those schools, where languages and arts may be taught free together, without the needless, unprofitable and inconvenient removing to another place. So all the land would be soon better civilized, and they who are taught freely at the public cost, might have their education given them on this condition, that therewith content, they should not gad for preferment out of their own country, but continue there thankful for what they received freely, bestowing it as freely on their country, without soaring above the meanness wherein they were born.

But how they shall live when they are thus bred and dismissed, will be still the sluggish objection. To which is answered, That those public foundations may be so instituted as the youth therein may be at once brought up to a competence of learning and to an honest trade; and the hours of teaching so ordered, as their study may be no hindrance to their labour or their calling. This was the breeding of St. Paul, though born of no mean parents, a free citizen of the Roman empire: so little did his trade debase him, that it rather enabled him to use that magnanimity of preaching the gospel through *Asia* and *Europe* at his own charges: thus those preachers among the poor *Waldenses*, the antient stock of our reformation, without these helps which I speak of, bred up themselves in trades, and especially in physic and surgery, as well as in the study of scripture (which is the only true theology), that they might be no burden to the church; and by the examples of Christ might cure both soul and body, through industry joining that to their ministry which he joined to his by gift of the Spirit. Thus relates *Peter Gilles*, in his

History of the *Waldenses* in *Piemont.*

But our ministers think scorn to use a trade, and count it the reproach of this age that tradesmen preach the gospel. It were to be wished they were all tradesmen; they would not then, so many of them, for want of another trade, make a trade of their preaching: and yet they clamour that tradesmen preach; and yet they preach, while they themselves are the worst tradesmen of all.

(Works. Folio. Vol. ii. 769—771.)

GLEANINGS; OR, SELECTIONS AND REFLECTIONS MADE IN A COURSE OF GENERAL READING.

No. CXVIII.

Prince of Wales spiritualized.

In "The New Spiritual Magazine" for November, 1783, is the following article of News, with the *Improvement.*

"Nov. 20. The Prince of Wales has declared his intention to attend parliament whenever any important questions are brought on the carpet, in order to make himself acquainted with the internal and external politics of the country.—*The Prince of the Kings of the Earth, even Jesus, has declared his intention to execute the counsels of the Eternal Three in behalf of his people, to supply all their wants out of his infinite fulness, to overrule every event for their good, to be their indulgent Saviour to the end of the world, and at length admit them to partake of his glory in heaven. Even so. Amen.*"

The same Magazine has reflections,

"1. *For one that hath a full barn, but no Christ.* 2. *For one that Christ but no barn.* 3. *For one that hath a full barn and Christ too.* 4. *For one that hath neither a barn nor Christ.*"

On the back of the title-page is advertised a new edition of the 4 first numbers, "*in which are expunged all those particulars relating to Mr. Wills, Mr. Sellon, Mr. Clayton, &c. which gave so much offence to some particular persons.*"

No. CXIX.

A Fore-runner of Professor Marsh.

On Wicliff's putting out his translation of the Bible, an universal clamour was immediately raised. *Knighton*, a canon of Leicester, and nearly a contemporary with the Reformer, has left us upon record the language of the times: "Christ entrusted his gospel," (says that ecclesiastic,) "to the clergy and doctors of the church, to minister it to the laity and weaker sort, according to their exigencies and several occasions. But this master John Wicliff, by translating it has made it vulgar; and has laid it more open to the laity, and even to women, who can read, than it used to be to the most learned of the clergy, and those of the best understanding; and thus the gospel jewel, the evangelical pearl, is thrown about and trodden under foot of swine."

No. CXX.

Athanasian Musician.

The Athanasian Creed is appointed to be said or sung in the English Church, and in the older editions of the Book of Common Prayer there is a versification of it by Sternhold and Hopkins This formulary would seem little accordant with any principles of harmony; yet Dr. Watts says, (Improv. of Mind. ch. xiv. § 9,) that he knew "a man of peculiar skill in music, who found out a great resemblance of the Athanasian doctrine of the Trinity in every single note, and he thought *it carried something of argument in it to prove that doctrine.*"

No. CXXI.
Popular Preaching.

The qualities in a preacher which attract popularity do not always ensure fame. Some of the most eminent writers that the Dissenters have produced were disregarded in the pulpit, or disesteemed in comparison with some of their cotemporaries whose names have scarcely survived them. Let our popular preachers read the history of Dr. Lardner, and learn to estimate aright the honours in which they plume themselves. That great scholar thus wrote in the year 1721, when he was more than 37 years of age. "I am yet at a loss how to dispose of myself. I can say I am desirous of being useful in the world. Without this, no external advantages relating to myself will make me happy; and yet I have no prospect of being serviceable in the work of the ministry; *having preached many years without being favoured with the approbation and choice of one congregation.*"—He was forty-five years of age before he obtained a settlement among the Dissenters. The rich Dissenting laity were remiss even in purchasing his works. A bank note of twenty pounds, sent to him by that excellent and munificent citizen, Thomas Hollis, was the greatest sum he ever received as a benefaction. He complained (how shameful that he should have had occasion to complain!) that *he had never received any mark of favour from the Dissenters; not*, said he, *so much as a trust:* alluding to Dr. Williams's charities and Library, the trustees of which consist of thirteen ministers and ten lay gentlemen. That body might have had the honour of making the first scholar in the world one of their number, and by electing him might have added to the satisfaction and pleasure of his life! But Dr. Lardner was deaf, and was moreover a Socinian.

No. CXXII.
Ruin of Monarchs.

Speed, the Chroniclist, says, "When princes are wilful and slothful, and their favourites flatterers, there needs no other enchantment to infatuate, yea, to ruinate the greatest monarchs."

No. CXXIII.
No Time in the Grave.

Of the Elector of Saxony, who died of an apoplexy in hunting, *Luther* observed, that when his highness waked in the morning of the resurrection, he would think he had just returned from hunting.

REVIEW.

Still pleas'd to praise, yet not afraid to blame.—POPE.

ART. I. *A Second Letter to the Rev. Herbert Marsh, D.D. F.R.S. Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, concerning the Opinion that the vital Principle of the Reformation has been lately conceded by him to the Church of Rome. By the Rev. Peter Gandolphy, Priest of the Catholic Church.* London, printed and published for the Author, by Keating, Brown and Keating, &c. &c. 1813. 8vo. pp. 101.

When a controversy is at once voluminous and important, a retrospect of its successive stages—of the questions at issue and of the nature of the arguments severally employed,—may answer useful ends. The discussions, of which the Bible Society has been the occasion and the subject, are perhaps approaching their termination. However, they are too interesting and remarkable to share the fate of the mass of the polemical effusions of the day: and men who are not indifferent to the main principles of Protestantism, will anxiously watch the progress of a dispute in which the cause of the Reformation is concerned.

Dr. Wordsworth, the respectable editor of "Ecclesiastical Biography," was, if we mistake not, the earliest of the Antibiblists: he laid before the public his apprehensions that the British and Foreign Bible Society would have an unfavourable influence on the state of certain long-established associations for the diffusion of religious knowledge at home and abroad. It was replied, that the world furnished ample scope for the efforts of *all* these societies, that their several exertions would animate each other's zeal, and that it seemed impossible for the interests of a *Protestant* church to be endangered, or for the duty of its ministers to be compromised, by measures of which the *sole* view is the circulation of the Scriptures. Indeed, it has been fully ascertained that the associations thus referred to, were insufficient for supplying even our poorer countrymen with the sacred volume.

After some minor combatants, whose names and feats do not deserve to be recorded, had shewn themselves on the stage, the "Margaret Professor of Divinity in Cambridge," at length, appeared. His strength was greater and his weapons were brighter than those of his predecessor in this conflict. To drop the figure, he was superior to Dr. Wordsworth in point of perspicuity and skill. He boldly aimed at proving that those members of the establishment act a hazardous and inconsistent part who join Dissenters in the distribution of the Bible, *unaccompanied by the Prayer-book.* For *them* to bestow the volume of heavenly truth *without this explanation of it*, was, he argued, to countenance a sort of *generalized Protestantism*, neither contained in creeds nor defined by articles: it was an improper concession to nonconformists—it was in fact giving them an ascendancy—it was to surrender the badge of a churchman, while no corresponding surrender was made by the dissidents. This declaration, nevertheless, could not be substantiated. The advocates of the Society assured him that the sacrifice was reciprocal; that if the churchman waves, *so far as he is a member* of this association, the circulation of the Liturgy, the nonconformist waves, for the same reason, and in the same connexion, the circulation of his favourite catechisms; that men are not precluded from distributing the prayer-book in other channels; and that since the establishment of the Bible Society, the distribution of it has considerably increased. To the force of these reasonings Dr. Marsh has been insensible: nor has even Mr. Vansittart, whose plainness and energy of argument in this discussion are happily combined with an engaging mildness of temper, succeeded in the attempt to convince him that his attack on the Bible Institution, is little consistent with the principles of Protestants.

The learned Professor has taken exception to some of its statements, or rather perhaps the statements of certain of its friends: "Its utility," says he, "has not been so conspicuous as you represent it in procuring translations of the Scriptures to be executed into foreign languages." Now, we believe the truth to be, that a few persons have advanced inadvertent and exaggerated assertions on this part of the subject. Still, the labours of this society *abroad*, as well as in our own country, have been widely beneficial: and we are of opinion that the Review of Dr. Marsh's *Inquiry*, *&c.* in one of the recent numbers of *the Christian Observer*, will, on the whole, satisfy the reader that this objection is less formidable in reality than in appearance.

We shall next refer to an Antibiblist, for whom, however we now differ from him, we feel great respect. In Dr. Maltby's judgment, to circulate *the whole* of the Bible, is unnecessary and useless—to circulate any part of it *without explanatory notes* is inexpedient. These propositions he has illustrated in a manner which exhibits his own acquaintance with scriptural criticism, and which deserves the regard of *all* ministers of religion: yet we think, and have endeavoured to shew, that his observations, valuable as many of them are in themselves, have no strict relation to the point at issue, and that the text of the Bible must be put into the hands of the people, before they can possess any curiosity to know on what principles they should interpret its contents.*

"The Margaret Professor of Divinity in Cambridge," is, after all, the grand champion of the antibiblists: nor has he yet retired from the field, nor is he likely to retire from it, while one opponent remains with whom he is not ashamed of combating. His eminent learning and abilities, (for eminent they are, notwithstanding they have been exerted with less advantage in this controversy than on some other occasions) have been long known to our readers. The name of Mr. Gandolphy, too, does not now appear for the first time in the pages of the Monthly Repository.[*] As a writer and a theologian, he has no claims on our esteem. His style bespeaks a pen unpracticed even in the correctness of English composition: and a divine, be he of what church he may, who in the nineteenth century, and in civilized Europe, appeals to the famous clause in 1 John v. 7, as authentic scripture, and who confounds biblical criticism with tradition,[†] must be pronounced either ignorant or bigoted in the extreme. Mr. Gandolphy seems to be a sincere and zealous Catholic who shrinks not from the avowal of his principles, nor fears to follow them to their proper consequences.

---

* Vol. VII. 704—711.

> "Nothing," he remarks to Dr. Marsh, "was ever more foreign from my thoughts, than to compliment you, for appealing to an authority, whilst arguing with the Dissenter, which the Dissenter does not admit. I should first endeavour to convince him of the necessity of admitting that authority; which was my real motive for inscribing to you THE SERMON ON THE INADEQUACY OF THE BIBLE TO BE AN EXCLUSIVE RULE OF FAITH. For admit but the principle of *authority*, and you must either be a Catholic, or what you have defined a *generalized Protestant*." 5, 6.

The author's meaning, no doubt, is, that the principle of *church authority* being admitted, consistency requires the person embracing it to be a Catholic; and that, for such an one there is no safe resting-place between submission to the Romish see and "generalized Protestantism."

This language is, nevertheless, inaccurate; the *generalized Protestantism* which he reprobates, and which consists in a firm avowal of the belief that Jesus is the Messiah, and that the scriptures are a sufficient rule of faith and practice, being perfectly irreconcileable to the ecclesiastical authority of which he is the advocate.

He afterwards observes,

> "You must, either admit that *the poor of the establishment* do not require the Common Prayer Book to keep them in the religion of their fathers, and secure them against "the delusions of *false interpretation*," whilst they have the Bible, or acknowledge that *another* evidence, another authority or *clue*, is necessary, and that is, what is styled in the Catholic church TRADITION, the WORD unwritten in the scriptures. Else, whence do you make a distinction of orders in the hierarchy of your church? Else how do you justify the practice of baptizing infants who have no actual faith? Else how do you dispense with the obligation of *washing one another's feet?* Else why do you keep holy the first day of the week instead of the sabbath day? Else why do you ever venture to eat blood or strangled meats? Else how do you justify in a minister of Christ the possession of *gold and silver* and rich livings? Else how do you justify the tendering and taking of oaths?" 7, 8.

These questions certainly merit the attention of the Margaret Professor. To some of them, we suspect, he will be rather perplexed in giving an answer which shall be wholly independent on the authority of a church that either *cannot* or *does not* err.

> "You affirm," adds Mr. Gandolphy, "that the religion of the church of England is the most correct system—the correct system of religion, (Inquiry, p. 11. Serm. p. 33,) the true system of religion, (p. 4,) but that those who have the Bible *alone* cannot find it, (Inquiry, pages 4, 8, 11, 27,) therefore this *most correct*, this *correct*, this *true* system cannot be found by the Bible *alone*." 9, 10.

In the twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth pages, the letter-writer reminds Dr. Marsh, that although

---

[*] Vol. VII. 182—184, and VIII. 204, 205.

[†] Pp. 31—37.

Protestantism is the established religion of Ireland, the great body of the Irish people are, however, Catholics: in a postscript he avers that "the scriptures lie about in Catholic families, like any other books, for any one to open," the reading of them not being prohibited; and he further says,

> "I neither owe the Pontiff, nor will I pay him, the homage of any *external* allegiance; and though I acknowledge in him the spiritual character of chief bishop and supreme pastor of Christ's church, surely that is easily distinguished from the character of a sovereign, of a prince or of a civil legislator."

For ourselves, we see no reason to distrust these declarations; and we should hope that Dr. Marsh will not lightly doubt what Mr. Gandolphy terms (97) "the word of a clergyman."

We have heard of two disputants (we think they were brothers)—the one a Catholic, the latter a Protestant—who converted each other to their respective systems. This will hardly be the effect of the present correspondence. Not only are the gentlemen before us unequally opposed, in point of knowledge and ability, but the Margaret Professor must be *experimentally* and *practically well* persuaded that as the religion of the church of Rome is not *true*, neither is it by law *established*.

ART. II. *Sermons, by Samuel Horsley, LL. D. F. R. S. F. A. S. late Lord Bishop of St. Asaph. Vol. III.* Dundee, printed: London, sold by Longman and Co. Rivingtons, &c. 1812. 8vo. pp. 334.

Our sentiments of the late Bishop Horsley as a writer and a preacher, have already been expressed*. There was something in his tone and manner and general character which forced us to consider him as

More like a soldier than a man o' the church ;

and ingenious and elaborate as are many of the Sermons in the present volume, we discover few marks in them of sobriety, and still fewer of humility of mind. But we will not detain our readers from the discourses themselves.

The first four (numbered 30, 31, 32, 33,) are from Malachi iii. 1, 2, the subject of them being *The Advent of the Messiah.* We agree with the prelate in regarding this text as a prediction of the Mediator of the new covenant; but we protest against two conclusions which he is eager to deduce from it;—the one, that the deliverer whose coming is here announced, was "the Jehovah of the Old Testament,"—the other, that the phraseology of the former of these verses, affords a proof of the deity of Jesus Christ. Among the theological fancies of ancient or modern times, none is grosser than the notion that he was the *angel* of the Jewish dispensation. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, whoever he was, could not but be more accurately informed on this subject than the divines of succeeding ages. He, in the beginning of his eloquent composition, has stated an unanswered and unanswerable argument against the hypothesis of God's having spoken "to the fathers" by "his Son:" and it is remarkable enough that, according to Morini and Hottinger, it it characteristic of the Samaritan translation of the

---

* Mon. Rep. Vol VI. 234—238.

Pentateuch to express the name *Jehovah* by *the angel of God.*[*]

As to the clause "the Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple," it describes the office, and not the nature of the Messiah: being, under God,[†] the head of the Christian church, he is styled the *Lord* of it;—"to us there is one Lord, Jesus Christ,"—"he is Lord of *all*," of *believing Jews and Gentiles.* The temple was *his*, because in that sacred edifice he was to communicate some of his instructions, to perform some of his miracles, and to exercise one of his most memorable acts of authority and power. For much the same reason, the Jewish nation are called, in John i. 11, *his* own *people*:—"he came unto *his own*, and *his own* received him not." Now they were the people, undoubtedly, of God: such they are often termed, and therefore, according to Bishop Horsley's ratiocination, Jesus must be God!

We learn from this preacher (37), assuredly not from the evangelists, that Christ, going up to Jerusalem to celebrate the passover, "found in the temple a market of live cattle, and bankers' shops, where strangers who came at this season from distant countries to Jerusalem *were accommodated with cash for their bills of credit.*" Lightfoot has given a different and juster account of the matter.[‡] The mind or the imagination of the deceased bishop, seems to have been familiar with the idea of "accommodation with cash for bills of credit:" yet, really, he should not have applied modern usages to an exposition of ancient writings. Be the advantages of "paper credit" what they may, still there is no evidence that Palestine was favoured in our Saviour's days with this "last and best supply."

The next discourse (the 34th), printed originally as a single sermon, is on *the Incarnation of Christ*, from Luke i. 28. It professes to represent the importance of our Lord's miraculous birth as a tenet of Christian faith, and assumes, rather than proves, the fact. The pomp, loftiness and arrogance of the preacher's language, ill conceal the extreme feebleness of his reasoning.

In the Sermon which follows (the 35th), from Deut. xv. 11, and which was before published, he undertakes to shew, "first, that poverty is a real evil, which, without any impeachment of the goodness or wisdom of Providence, the constitution of the world actually admits; secondly, that the providential appointment of this evil, in subservience to the general good, brings a particular obligation upon men in civilized society to concur for the immediate extinction of the evil wherever it appears." These propositions are illustrated with some novelty, and for the most part strength of argument; and a pertinent application is then made of them to the occasion[*] of the discourse.

Mr. Horsley, the editor of this volume, ingenuously avows in the advertisement prefixed to it, that in his desire to withhold nothing of his revered father's from the public that could be given to them, he "may have suffered one or two sermons to appear which he himself, had he conducted the work, would have suppressed." The 36th discourse, which treats of the resurrection of Lazarus, from John xi. 25, 26, answers, we think, to this description. A few sentences in it however are not unworthy of seeing the light: and with these we are so much pleased, that we transcribe them :—

---

[*] Eichhorn's Kritische Schriften, Erster Bend, 581.

[†] Acts ii. 36.

[‡] Horæ Hebraicæ, &c. on Matt. xx. 12.

[*] The Anniversary Meeting of the Sons of the Clergy.

> "Nothing is so much a genuine mark of barbarism as an obstinate incredulity. The evil minded and the illiterate, from very different causes, agree however in this, that they are always the last to believe upon any evidence less than the testimony of their own senses. Ingenuous minds are unwilling to suspect those frauds in other men to which they feel an aversion themselves: they always therefore give testimony its fair weight.——The man of science and speculation, as his knowledge enlarges, loses his attachment to a principle to which the barbarian steadily adheres—that of measuring the probability of strange facts by his own experience. He will be at least as slow to reject as to receive testimony; and he will avoid that obstinacy of unbelief which is satisfied with nothing but ocular demonstration, as of all erroneous principles the most dangerous and the greatest obstacle to the mind's improvement. The illiterate man, unimproved by study and by conversation, thinks that nothing can be of which he hath not seen the like: from a diffidence perhaps of his own ability to examine evidence, he is always jealous that you have an intention to impose upon him, and mean to sport with his credulity: hence his own senses are the only witnesses to which he will give credit." 120, 121, 122.

There is an air of originality in the two succeeding sermons (the 37th and the 38th,) of both which the text is Mark vii. 26, and the topic, *Our Lord's conduct and language to a woman of Syrophœnicia.* The preacher observes, that "the mercy shewn to this deserving woman, by the edification which is conveyed in the manner in which the favour was conferred, was rendered a blessing to the whole church; inasmuch as it was the seal of the merit of the righteousness of faith,—not of *faith separable from good works*, consisting in a mere assent to facts; but of that faith which is the root of every good work—of that faith which consists in a trust in God, and a reliance on his mercy, founded on a just sense of his perfections." 173.

In the 39th discourse, preached before the Humane Society in 1789, and soon afterwards printed singly, there is much to be admired. The prelate takes Ecclesiastes xii. 7. as his text, and considers "human life as undeniably a compound of the three principles of intelligence, perception and vegetation,—death as consisting in nothing less than the dissolution of that union of soul and body, which Moses makes the principle of vitality, and this disunion as a thing subsequent, in the natural and common course of things, to the cessation of the mechanical life of the body." How far these views are theologically or physiologically correct, we do not now enquire. We are much gratified however by the eloquence with which the Bishop recommends the institution whose cause he was requested to plead, and especially by his address to some of the persons who had experienced its salutary aid. Having observed that it had been instrumental to the religious welfare of no small number, he proceeds thus:

> "They stand here before you, whose recovered and reformed lives are the proof of my assertions. Let them plead, if my persuasion fail, let them plead the cause of their benefactors. Stand forth and tell, my brethren, to whom you owe

it under God that you stand here this day alive! Tell what in those dreadful moments were your feelings, when on a sudden you found yourselves surrounded with the snares of death, when the gates of destruction seemed opening to receive you, and the overflowings of your own ungodliness made you horribly afraid! Tell what were your feelings when the bright scene of life opened afresh upon the wondering eye, and all you had suffered and all you had feared seemed vanished like a dream! Tell what were the mutual feelings when first you revisited your families and friends!—of the child returning to the fond parent's care—of the father receiving back from the grave the joy, the solace of his age—of the husband restored to the wife of his bosom—of the wife, not yet a widow, again embracing her yet living lord! Tell what are now your happy feelings of inward peace and satisfaction, sinners rescued from the power of darkness, awakened to repentance, and reconciled to God! Your interesting tale will touch each charitable heart, and be the means of procuring deliverance for many from the like dangers which threatened your bodies and your souls." 199, 200.

In No. 40 we again find Dr. H. the advocate of a public charity. This discourse, from Matt. xxiv. 12, was preached for the Philanthropic Society in March 1792, and was printed, if we mistake not, within the same year. It is an animated, and we believe, a faithful contrast of the manners of the ancient Heathens with those of the Christian world and of modern times. With the exception of the Slave Trade (an exception in which this country no longer shares,) a decided preference is given to the morals of the present day. Still, as our author remarks, ages must elapse before the means of reforming the hearts and lives of men can produce their full effect: and hence he ably enlarges on the excellencies of the institution to the service of which this sermon was devoted.

Of the 41st and the 42d, from John xx. 29, *the incredulity of Thomas* is the subject. The Bishop first considers what ground there might be for this apostle to believe the fact of our Lord's resurrection upon the report of the other ten apostles, before he had himself seen him; and from what motives it may be supposed that he withheld his assent. In the second place he professes to shew that the belief of any thing upon such evidence as Thomas at last had of Christ's resurrection, is a natural act of the human mind, to which nothing of moral or religious merit can reasonably be ascribed. And, lastly, he inquires what is the merit and at the same time what is the certainty of that faith which believes what it hath not seen: its value he, accordingly, resolves into the devotional and moral principles on which it is founded.

There are parts of his argument from which we dissent: and his method of discoursing on this memorable declaration of our Lord's to Thomas, we regard as not a little circuitous and complex. The passage simply teaches that *testimony* is a legitimate branch of the evidences of revelation, and that he who admits it as such, gives proof of greater strength of mind, juster knowledge of the limits of the human faculties, more patience of inquiry, and more fairness and humility of disposition than the man who receives nothing as a fact but on the report of his senses.

We now come to a very curious sermon, (the 43d) preached at the anniversary of the institution of the Magdalen Hospital, April 22, 1795, and subsequently presented to the public in a separate form. Addressing his audience from 1 John iii. 3. the Right Reverend preacher lays down the proposition that "certain exquisite sensations of delight produced by external objects acting upon corporeal organs, will constitute some part of the future happiness of the just." This doctrine he endeavours to establish by the aid of considerations derived from the frame of man, and by what he presumes to be the explicit assertions of the Holy Scriptures. He then expatiates on the nature and qualifications of heavenly bliss, and after speaking of the purity which it supposes and requires, makes a transition to the claims of the charity which has just been mentioned. We cannot so far compliment his memory as to say that he has unfolded his reasoning with all the delicacy of thought and language which was demanded by the magnitude of his subject and the situation of his hearers.

He insists on 2 Cor. v. 10, which passage, he contends, has lost "somewhat in our public translation of the precision of the original text," and which he would render, "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things in the body, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad." But the alteration is both unwarrantable and unnecessary.* The single, though usually respectable authority of the Syriac version, (for it has really no countenance from the Vulgate,) cannot support it: and whoever will look into Schleusner's *Lexicon*, &c. under the word *δια*, No. 13, will find that this preposition has exactly the same force in other texts of the New Testament. Τα [scil πεπραγμενα] δια τȣ σωματος, are 'the deeds done *throughout the whole course* of mortal life.'

The doctrine of the 44th and last sermon from Rom. xiii. 1. when divested of the pomp of style, the parade of argument, the fierceness of invective, and the bitterness of execration with which it is delivered, amounts to little more than this—that in ordinary times obedience to the civil magistrate, is a religious duty. This lesson we had long since welcomed, more clearly illustrated as it is, and more soberly and cautiously qualified, by Paley. Our Bishop, preaching before the House of Lords on Jan. 30th, 1793, deems it seasonable to censure, with a lofty air, "the freedom of dispute in which for several years past it hath been the folly in this country to indulge, upon matters of such high importance as the origin of government and the authority of sovereigns." Such a discourse, *at such a period*, was sure of being soon printed, at the request of the noble and right reverend audience: and as the prelate, at the conclusion of it, had pronounced upon certain reputed levellers and republicans this episcopal curse—"they have no claim upon our brotherly affection: upon our charity they have indeed a claim: Miserable men! *they are in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity.*" Mr. Hall, then of Cambridge, thus noticed, in the preface to his *Apology for the Freedom of the Press, &c.* both parts of the Anathema:

"With respect to the first, we must

---

* Compare with the above text Ephes. vi. 8.

have plenty of that article, since he has distilled his own; and if the bonds of iniquity are not added, it is only because they are not within the reach of his mighty malice."

In an Appendix to this sermon, Dr. H. employs needless pains to obviate the suspicion that Calvin's political tenets were virtually *Jacobinical!*

The attention bestowed by us on these discourses may shew that we are desirous of doing justice to the literary merits of the late Bishop of St. Asaph. Excellencies of this kind he certainly possessed. His style, though sometimes careless or vulgar, and sometimes ludicrously stately and magisterial, claims, on the whole, our admiration: it is generally energetic, in many passages, truly elegant, in many, dignified and impressive. It is easy to perceive that his mind was in no common degree cultivated and active; and, whatever be our opinion of his theology, we gladly acknowledge that he at least aimed at being a scriptural and Christian preacher.

What shall we say, however, to the manner in which he quotes and explains some of the texts that he brings forward to his aid. Here he is seldom judicious and accurate: he either falls into paradoxes or adopts trite and refuted criticisms. For example, he cites Jerem. xxiii. 6. in behalf of what he terms "the true doctrine," viz. the essential deity of Christ; notwithstanding Dr. Blayney has evinced* that it requires a different rendering and, by consequence, bears no testimony in favour of the popular belief. In the same manner, the phrase "made, [or born] of a woman," is adduced in demonstration of the supernatural birth of Jésus (Gal. iv. 4.); though from this interpretation it would follow, according to what we read in Job xiv. 1. [the former clause] that *all* mankind are *miraculously* born! 8, 9, 82.

But the worst of the Bishop's feats of criticism,* are creditable in comparison of his forgetfulness of the rules of courtesy and decorum, when he speaks of persons from whom it is his fortune to differ on points of metaphysics, theology or ecclesiastical or civil discipline. The hypothesis, for instance, of those who maintain the materiality of the sentient principle, or rather the *homogeneity* of of Man and his unconscious state between death and the resurrection, is stigmatized (129) as having "less coherence than the drunkard's dram." Mede, Sykes, Farmer, &c. are sneered at (153), not indeed by name but by direct implication, as "philosophizing believers, weak in faith and not strong in reason." Even Locke† is in fact arraigned for speculating with freedom on "the origin of government and the authority of sovereigns" (286, 287). Hoadly is designated as "the republican Bishop" (299). And Milton is rashly charged with the utterance of a gross falsehood for party purposes (332).

The editors of posthumous works are far more likely to injure the reputation of authors by the "desire of withholding nothing" which can be given to the world than by the fear of giving it too much. Mr. Horsley had amply satisfied the demands of filial duty and the interests, if not the wishes, of the public, by two volumes of his father's sermons. Nevertheless, in his capacity of editor, he deserves the praise of having carefully superintended the printing of all three; and the typographical execution of them does eminent credit to the state of the Dundee press.

---

* Translation and Notes in loco.

* See a notable specimen of them in p. 154.

† It appears that the learned Selden was one of the writers who "presumed to treat these curious questions" much as Locke did afterwards. *Lives of Selden and Usher*, by Dr. Aikin, pp. 179, 180.

Art. III. *Memoirs of the late Reverend Theophilus Lindsey, M.A. including a Brief Analysis of his Works, together with Anecdotes and Letters of eminent Persons, his Friends and Correspondents: also a General View of the Progress of the Unitarian Doctrine in England and America. By Thomas Belsham, Minister of the Chapel in Essex Street.* 8vo. pp. 568. Johnson and Co. 1812.

[Continued from p. 201].

On resigning the living of Catterick, Mr. Lindsey wrote and circulated an "Address to his Parishioners," alluded to in his letter to Mr. Turner (p. 200); and soon after, he published his "Apology," one of the most interesting pictures of an honest and enlightened mind which was ever laid before the world. This work passed, in less than ten years, through four editions.

It has appeared (p. 201) that Mr. Lindsey's design was to "gather a church of Unitarian Christians out of the Established Church:" with this view he came up to London in the beginning of the year 1774. Here he had to encounter the inconveniences of narrow circumstances and the difficulties of a new and hazardous undertaking. But Providence raised up friends for him, chiefly from amongst the Dissenters: of these Mr. Belsham has particularised Dr. Price, Dr. Priestley and Mr. Shore. "And by the exertions of the late Mr. Joseph Johnson, of St. Paul's Churchyard, a room was soon found and taken, in Essex-house, Essex-street, which having been before used as an auction room, might, at a moderate expense, be fitted up as a temporary chapel." (p. 101.) The Westminster justices hesitated, however, in granting a licence to open it.

The following is an extract of a letter from Mr. Lindsey to Dr. Jebb:

"I have the pleasure of assuring you that our difficulties are over, and we certainly begin, (may it be with the divine blessing upon us!) on Sunday next. But we have not succeeded without striking with the great hammer, if I may so speak. For this morning Mr. Johnson the bookseller went, according as he was appointed, to Hicks's Hall, and was there at the opening of the court. He got the clerk to move for him, that he was waiting to have our entry recorded, as the court had given him reason to expect. But Lord Ward, who was that day in the chair, said it was a matter of some deliberation, and must be set over till the next meeting, i. e. Saturday. It appeared from hence that they would put us off civilly, and leave us in the lurch at last. I met Johnson coming out of the court, and took him with me to Mr. Lee, who was engaged at Guildhall, where I found him pleading before Chief Justice De Grey. I got to him, however, and told him our situation. He said it did not look well; but that the Chief Justice's

Court would soon be up, and he would go immediately to Hicks's Hall and see what was to be done. He came like a lion soon; 'desired to see the entry that had been given into the court, to license a place of worship for a society of Dissenters; was sorry such unusual obstructions had been put to so legal a demand; that he understood it was said by some, that the Justices had a discretionary power in such cases; that they were mistaken; that, on the contrary, they were merely official; and if they refused, a mandamus from the King's Bench would compel them; that he hoped the great Magna Charta of the religious liberty of Englishmen was not now going to be attacked.' Upon this, one or two of the Justices said it was their opinion, and always had been, as Mr. Lee's, that they had no discretionary powers. On something being said concerning the doctrine to be preached, and the officiating minister, that some enquiry was to be made about them, he told them that 'those were subsequent facts and matters of enquiry; that the house of worship was the object before them, and they were bound to make record of it as desired.' After this, on a pause being made, he desired to know 'whether the court would give him the trouble to come again the next day and move the matter and argue it before them, or would now grant it.' The latter was conceded, and our certificate it was said should be ready next court day. We begin, however, without it on the authority of our counsel."* pp. 108—110.

Essex Chapel was opened on Sunday, April 17, 1774; an era in the history of Unitarianism in this country; for though there had been long before this period Dissenting congregations, of the Presbyterian denomination chiefly, which might be called Unitarian,* there had been no public instance of a place of worship being opened for the avowed purpose of worshipping God the Father only. At the present day, such an event excites comparatively little notice; we fearlessly emblazon our Unitarianism on our portals, and take our rank amidst the well-known and legally-recognized sects of the nation; but very different was the case forty years ago, and we think Mr. Belsham has judiciously set before the reader, at full length, the proceedings relative to the procurement and opening of the chapel, which his unwearied labours still entitle to Bishop Horsley's sarcastic appellation — *the oracle of Unitarianism.*

The following account of the opening, was sent the next day by Mr. Lee, in a letter to his friend Mr. Cappe:—

"After a little difficulty in getting his chapel registered at the Quarter Sessions, which I had the good luck to remove, he entered upon his ministry yesterday. His chapel is a large upper room in Essex House, Essex-street, in a very central part of London, and in my neighbourhood. The place is convenient for the purpose of containing about 300 persons; a greater number would

---

"* The fact however was, that the certificate was never granted, nor was the chapel registered or licensed as a place of worship till after the defect had been noticed by Dr. Horsley, in his Letters to Dr. Priestley; after which the neglect was immediately and without any difficulty rectified."

* Of these deserves to be singled out Dr. C. Fleming's congregation at Pinner's Hall, which had also enjoyed the eminent and rational services of Dr. James Foster. Dr. Fleming was an able, determined and plain-spoken Unitarian advocate. He died in 1779 when several members of his congregation united themselves, we believe, with Mr. Lindsey's flock.

crowd it. He was well attended, considering that no public notice was given of the intended service. There were about ten coaches at the door; which I was glad of, because it gave a degree of respectableness to the congregation, in the eyes of the people living thereabouts. Of those that I knew and remember were Lord Despenser, Dr. Franklin, Dr Priestley, Dr. Calder, Mr. Shore, jun. Mrs. Shore, Mrs. Robert Milnes, Miss Milnes, and Miss Shore; Dr. Hinckley, Dr. Chambers, Dr. Primatt, and two or three other clergymen, with a few barristers whom you do not know. All the rest were to all appearance persons of condition, and in the whole were, I think, near two hundred, and mostly of the Establishment. We were all pleased with the service and with his manner of performing it. His sermon, which I thought very good, will be printed, and you will of course see it. I begin to conceive hopes that his scheme will be patronized, so far at least as to produce him a comfortable subsistence. Indeed, I hope it will teach those who ought not to have needed such teachings, that reformation is both a safe and an easy work ." (p. 111.)

Consistently with his design of gathering an Unitarian society out the dissatisfied members of the Established Church, Mr. Lindsey departed no further from the mode of the national worship than was required by the great principle on which he separated from it. He therefore published *A Reformed Liturgy*, on the plan of Dr. Clarke's, which he used from the beginning, and which, with alterations and improvements, is still in use at Essex-street Chapel. He also retained the clerical dress, with the exception of the *surplice*, concerning which he says in a letter to Dr. Jebb, "*I should have blushed to have appeared in a white garment*;" although we do not clearly see why he should have been less ashamed of a black gown than of a white one: both appear to us to be at least unnecessary, and not quite consistent with the manly simplicity which is the proper distinction and the true ornament of seceders upon principle from the national establishment. But we are aware that there may be prejudices against, as well as in favour of priestly vestments, and at this time of day these are not just objects of controversy. On the one side it will be admitted that habiliments do not dignify the preacher, as it will on the other that the preacher may dignify his habiliments.——On the recommendation of his attentive and judicious friend, Mr. Turner, of Wakefield, a prayer was introduced by Mr. Lindsey, both before and after sermon; the latter bearing a reference to the subject of discourse. We allude to this custom of Mr. Lindsey, in order to express our opinion of the Prayers appended to his Sermons, lately published, which have the pertinence and solemnity and simplicity, together with the vein of pious feeling running through them, which so eminently characterize the latter portions of the national liturgy. The sermon at the opening was published, with an Appendix, containing an account of the Reformed Liturgy: of the Sermon, five hundred copies were disposed of in four days, and of the Liturgy seven hundred copies were sold in six weeks.

In the Sermon, the preacher entered of necessity into a vindication of the Unitarian faith, but he somewhat strangely promised that he would do so in the pulpit no more: on this subject, however, let us hear Mr. Belsham, whose reflections are entitled to the serious consideration of such ministers as sacrifice to prudence more than to truth :—

"Upon this occasion Mr. Lindsey, by the advice of Dr. Jebb and his Cambridge friends, but as he soon discovered without due consideration of the subject, pledged himself in pretty strong language, not to introduce disputed points into his public discourses. "Far will it be from my purpose," says he, "ever to treat of controversial matters from this place." But if popular and pernicious errors are not to be combated, and if the plain, simple doctrine of Christianity is not to be taught from the pulpit, it is difficult to say how public attention is to be excited: how the mass of hearers are to be instructed, and how truth is to make its way. In fact it appears, that where public teachers have confined themselves to mere moral instruction and have either not touched at all upon Christian doctrine, or have veiled their real opinions under ambiguous language, the consequence has often been, that the teacher, by reading and reflection has become enlightened, while the hearer has been left in darkness; the preacher has reformed his speculative creed, while the hearers have retained all the erroneous and unscriptural notions which their pastor has long ago renounced. And as a natural consequence, when a vacancy has occurred, a successor has not unfrequently been appointed whose system has been directly opposite to that of the person who immediately preceded him. Those who hold sentiments to which they give the pompous name of orthodox or evangelical, never decline to avow their systems in the most manly and explicit manner. And they do right, while they believe those sentiments to be true and important. How unbecoming then is it, for those who hold a better and a purer faith, to shrink from the public profession and defence of it, and to leave the adversary master of the field. It is a silly objection which is urged by some weak, or timid, or indolent, I will not say interested, persons, that speculative preaching, as they call it, tends to diminish a serious and pious disposition, and to promote a sectarian spirit. As to the latter part of the objection, let them read Sir George Savile's remark upon the subject of sectaries: and with respect to the former, I confess I could never see how the increase of knowledge had a tendency to produce deterioration of practice; and he would be a very injudicious teacher who did not combine practical exhortation with doctrinal instruction.

"Yesterday," says Mr. Lindsey, in a letter to Dr. Jebb, dated May 23, "I ventured to deviate from the idea which you and my friends with you seemed to entertain as right, of preaching merely practical discourses, and enlarged with much earnestness on John xvii. 3. I find it was acceptable to many, and that it was even looked for that I should sometimes treat upon the great object and principle on which our new church is formed, in order to confirm some that are already come out, and awaken others to come out of Babylon. But I expect the greatest effects, by and by, through the nation, from the thunder of your's, of Mr. —'s, and Mr. —'s apologies, for you can never go out in mute silence and without bearing your testimonies against her witchcraft and idolatries." pp. 115---119.

Amongst Mr. Lindsey's earliest hearers, are found several distinguished names; Sir George Savile, Mr. Serjeant Adair, Mr. Dodson, Sir Barnard Turner, Mr. Leake, and Mrs. Rayner. Of this lady, a near relation of the Duchess of Northumberland and of Lord Gwydir, Mr. Belsham has given an interesting sketch, which we cannot pass over :—

"She was married to a gentleman of large fortune and was attracted by curiosity and the invitation of a friend to hear the new doctrine at Essex Street, on the day when the chapel was first opened. Through the whole service her eyes were fixed, and her attention riveted upon the preacher, and when it was over, she and Mr. Rayner introduced themselves to Mr. and Mrs. Lindsey, and from that time to the end of life she became a constant hearer at the chapel, and a firm and generous friend to Mr. Lindsey, and to the cause which he supported, and for which he suffered. Mrs. Rayner was a lady of open and unaffected manners, of superior intellect, and of a well-informed mind. She possessed unbounded generosity of spirit, and especially after the death of Mr. Rayner, denied herself almost what was necessary to support her rank and station in life, that she might spend her money in acts of great but not indiscriminate munificence. She became a liberal and powerful patroness of the cause of truth. And to this lady the Christian world is indebted for the publication of one of the most learned and most useful theological works which the age has produced: Dr. Priestley's History of Early Opinions concerning Christ. A work which demonstrates, in a manner which never has been and never can be confuted, that from the earliest age of the Christian religion, down to the fourth century, and to the time of Athanasius himself, the great body of unlearned Christians were strictly Unitarians, and consequently that this was the original doctrine concerning the person of Christ. This most valuable treatise was a work of great labour and expense, the demand for which would by no means have defrayed the charge of the publication. But Mrs. Rayner, with exemplary generosity, supplied the money, and to her the work is with great propriety dedicated. Many other acts of this lady's princely munificence might be mentioned, which almost exceed belief in a selfish and irreligious age. But she sought not worldly applause; and she is now gone where her works and virtues will follow her, to receive their appropriate and everlasting reward." pp. 119---121.

To be continued.

Art. IV. *A Letter to a Friend in the Country*, &c. &c. on the Dissenting Ministers' Petition, and the Rev. J. Ivimey's Correspondence with J. Butterworth, Esq. M. P. *By John Evans, A. M.* 2d ed. pp. 32. Sherwood and Co. 1813.

Mr. Ivimey is a Baptist minister, who has written a History of his own Denomination, whom he lauds for being the first to understand Christian liberty and the most zealous in opposing all persecution for the sake of conscience; and the same Mr. Ivimey has distinguished himself, along with Dr. Duigenan and other eminent persons, on the side of No Popery, or in other words, of the oppression of the Catholics. But Mr. Ivimey had a right to sustain the two different characters of an eulogist of religious liberty and an assertor of the necessity of penal laws against Romish heretics; though he had no right, we humbly presume, to misrepresent the proceedings of his brethren and to betray a member of parliament into a seeming breach of verity.

The case is briefly this:—the Protestant Dissenting Ministers of London and Westminster, met in February last, and voted, as they thought *unanimously*, Resolutions and a Petition to the legislature, in favour of universal religious liberty. Mr. W. Smith, on presenting their petition to the House of Commons, called it *unanimous*, but was corrected by Mr. Butterworth, the member for Coventry, who stated that he had good authority for denying its being unanimous, or being even the sense of the majority of the ministers. In March, the ministers met again, and resolved that their petition had passed *unanimously*; and a copy of their resolution was forwarded to Mr. Butterworth; upon which he gave up his authority for his statement in the House, to wit, the aforesaid *Mr. Ivimey*, one of the body of ministers, who had been present at both the meetings above specified. Hereupon, Mr. Ivimey was put upon his justification; and his defence, as far as we understand it, is—that in 1812 the ministers actually divided upon a similar petition to that resolved on in 1813, upon which they did not indeed divide, but upon which they might have divided—that he and several others, though they did not lift up their hands against the petition, wish they had done so, and for himself, he would have done so, if his fortitude had not forsaken him—and that as the *minds* of all the ministers were known to be not favourably disposed to universal liberty (including the case of the Catholics), the proceedings should have been marked by the words *nemine contradicente*, and not by the word *unanimously*.

In addition to this notable self-defence, Mr. Ivimey turns *accuser of the brethren*, and shews the Trustees of Dr. Williams's Library, the Presbyterians and the General Baptists, that though he had not the courage to raise his arm against their petition, he is bold enough to asperse their characters.

Mr. Evans, in his Letter, corrects the misrepresentations and chastises the disingenuousness and bigotry of this No Popery railer, and "takes leave of him with a piece of salutary and evangelical advice—*Sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee.*"

ART. V. *The Salvation of Man by the Free Grace of God asserted and vindicated.* A Sermon preached at the Octagon Chapel, Norwich. By Thomas Madge. 8vo. pp. 66. Johnson. 1812.

Three propositions are laid down and argued in this discourse: I. That all our blessings come from God; II. That the pardon of sin proceeds entirely from his free grace; and III. That the only conditions of the Divine mercy are repentance, amendment and holiness of life. The preacher opposes the Unitarian view of God as a Father to the Calvinistic scheme of imputation, vindictive justice and proscription. His discourse is entitled to the praise equally of sound reasoning and good writing.

Several *notes* are added to the Sermon, in one of which the Calvinistic doctrine of atonement is stated in the words of Calvinistic writers, and some pertinent remarks are made upon Dr. Magee's Discourses: we notice this in order to express our wish that Mr. Madge would fulfil his design (pp. 57, 58) of animadverting upon Dr. Magee in a separate pamphlet. It would be easy to answer all the real arguments of this desultory and shewy polemic, and we commit him into the hands of Mr. Madge, who will not, we hope, be unmindful of a pledge which the talents displayed in his sermon will induce his readers generally to call upon him to redeem.

OBITUARY.

The Rev. W. Mann, on the Letters concerning Mr. J. Coventry.

[*In a Letter to the Editor.*]

Sic fatus senior, telumq; imbelle sine ictu
Conjecit.

SIR,

In your Obituary for the last month, (p. 278) there is an article, relative to the death of *Mr. John Coventry*, of Saint Savior's, Southwark, which not only highly reflects on my ministerial conduct, but charges me with direct falsehood; a charge, which, if it could be substantiated, would stamp my character, and my name, with obloquy and infamy.

This article, it is more than probable, I should never have seen, nor perhaps heard of, had it not been left with me a few days ago, for the purpose, by a person unknown; and, if the writer had confined himself in it to the supposed truth of his own system, or to the error of mine, he would not have drawn from me a single remark: he might have plumed himself with the honours of a fancied victory; and all, on my part, should have been a profound, uninterrupted taciturnity.

There is one point, Mr. Editor, and only one, on which I have any feeling; it relates to a fact which your correspondent has stated; and I have only one request to make of you, and which you cannot in justice deny me; that you will give the same publicity to *my* statement of that fact, which you have already given to *his*. I shall make no enquiry into the source of his information; that is his affair, not mine: on its credit, whatever that may be, he has thought proper to rest his cause: it puts words into my mouth, which I never used, and imputes to them a meaning, which I never expressed—but the premises, the argument, and the conclusion, are of the same hue,—the whole a tissue of cunning misrepresentation, and worse than indirect, equivocating falsehood.

It is true, that I attended the dying bed of my father in law. I saw him at least once, generally twice, every day, during his illness, and to the latest moments of his existence in this world. He opened to me all his heart; and I knew all the "*circumstances*" which occasioned his distress of mind. This is of consequence, only as it may serve to shew, how far I was qualified to form a true judgment, *had I been disposed to tell the truth*; and whether I was authorised to give an opinion, in what is called a funeral sermon.

I did not, Sir, attribute the darkness, which beclouded the last moments of our dear father, to the influence of the "Winchesterian system" as "the principal cause;" but only as *one* among many other causes, which I then enumerated: *that* did not occupy a larger portion of time than other particulars; nor did it obtain any other prominence, or pre-eminence, than was naturally given to it by the novelty of the subject. Now, Sir, the difference between assigning a reason as *the principal cause*, and mentioning it only as *one* in common with many other causes, which were all named and applied in the same manner, and allowed their equal weight in the scale of just consideration; the different colouring which is given to the same fact, by such a representation;—the shade into which it throws all other points of the same subject;—and the disingenuousness of the relater and the writer, are so manifest, that argument would here be quite superfluous.

But, in one of those conversations, which I had with the deceased, in some of his last hours, and as I saw his end approaching, I felt it my duty to deal faithfully with him—whether the impression of my mind, at this time, was a true ministerial affection, or only the impulse of fanaticism, does not at all enter into the present question, Mr. Editor; such was my feeling; and I did express my fear, that his mind had received serious injury from a former connexion; that his principles had been relaxed, and their tone lowered; that he had been put off his guard; that he had neglected his privilege, and lost that peace and comfort which once he enjoyed. He replied—"That he had long since abandoned that connexion to which I alluded; that he had been so dissatisfied," I think he said "disgusted, with what he had heard, that he had not attended their worship, nor associated with them, for many years: that he had sent for an old friend (the writer of the article to which I am now replying) on purpose that he might tell him his mind on the subject, &c."

This, Sir, is the relation which I made in the pulpit; and it is either true or false. I say this, because it is more than intimated, it is pretty roundly asserted, by your correspondent, in the general tenor of his paper, and with a modesty peculiarly his own, that the story was of my own fabrication! that I told a lie in the pulpit!!! Not that my reputation is likely to suffer by the slander: I anticipate no danger in placing my single credit against that of your correspondent: I am not indeed aware that it was ever before called into question: what I said in the pulpit, Mr. Editor, will be believed, and would have been believed, though I had remained silent. It so happens, however, that the truth of the relation does not depend solely on my testimony. There were three or four other persons, standing round the bed of the deceased at the time he made the declaration. They have voluntarily offered their names as below; and we are all ready, if it were necessary, to give the same testimony upon oath; which will afford your correspondent an opportunity of convicting us of a conspiracy, or of indictiing us for perjury. He says, "he never once intimated to me the least change in his mind respecting his view of the restoration of mankind:" nor did I, sir, on the occasion above alluded to, name the word restoration of mankind, but *verbum sapienti sat est*; he well understood my meaning, for we had often before conversed on the same subject. But I can refresh the memory of your correspondent, by another part of the same conversation, which I *did not* relate in the pulpit; and perhaps the hint, if considered in all its bearings, may assist his conception, as to what I mean by "mere quibblers." I asked the deceased whether he *had* conversed with his friend, and what answer he gave? It was this, "I read the scriptures impartially for myself, and I will form my own opinion;" or words to this effect; by which I understood Mr. C. to mean, that by this answer he was prevented from saying what otherwise it was his intention to have said.

And now, Mr. Editor, that your correspondent has told you what he *believes*, I will tell you what I *know*. I *know* that Mr. Coventry had entirely withdrawn from a certain connexion long before I "married his daughter," or had any intimacy with the family. I *know* that his principles, even with respect to the "restoration of mankind," whether true or false, were shaken many years ago; and that whatever wish he might feel to retain them, he could neither support them in argument, nor was his mind at rest under the impression of them. I also *know*, which is of still more importance, and which I declare in the most solemn manner, *that he died in the full conviction of the truth of that system which* "Mr. Mann would call the evangelical plan of salvation;" *that he expressed that conviction in the strongest terms which language could utter, and, I had almost said, by a thousand reiterations of that expression.*

I have conscientiously, and equally, refrained from any remarks favorable to my own system, or unfriendly to that of your correspondent. His attack on my personal truth, in the relation of a matter of fact, is, I repeat, the only consideration which could have thus extorted from me a single word in reply: an attack, feeble indeed in its effect, like that of the old man to whom I refer in my motto; but made with far less honorable motives: its notorious indecency, even in this age when there are no wonders, really astonishes me. Had the writer been some *young* champion, desirous of provoking, or rather of creating, an adversary, for the purpose of throwing a lance with him in the polemical field, it would have excited no surprise; but, that an old man, like him, on the very verge of the grave, and whom hoary hairs ought to have better instructed in the rules of decorum and prudence, should, from partiality to a system, from prejudice, or any other infirmity of his nature, have taken it for granted, that an authorized minister of the establishment could so far forget the responsibility of his character, as to relate in the pulpit what was not strictly true, and that, too, on an occasion the most solemn, and in the very presence of those who were acquainted with the circumstances, and could easily have contradicted him, if he had spoken falsely!—that he should not only have believed all this, without any evidence, but also have asserted it in the most public and offensive manner!—is such a mixture of weakness, folly and temerity, that I can give to it no adequate name.

I am, Sir,
Very respectfully, your's &c.
W. MANN.

St. Savior's, 19th May, 1813.

We whose names are under-written, were present when Mr. Coventry made the declaration as stated above; and we testify that the words convey the direct sense which he gave, and are, as far as we recollect, the very words which he used on that occasion.

J. C. PEACHE.
A. MANN.
A. PEACHE.

Mrs. Naish.

On May 3rd, died at Poole, Mrs. Naish, the wife of Mr. Naish, to whom she had been married eleven months. Mrs. N. was the youngest daughter of the late Joseph Olive, Esq. a respectable merchant of this place. The family from which she descended has afforded many worthy members to the old Unitarian Meeting in Hill Street. Liberty of conscience, and the right of private judgment, so peculiarly asserted by the congregation assembling in that place of worship, for the last 60 years, were ably defended by an ancestor of Mrs. N. in a series of Letters addressed to Mr. Philips, the seceding minister. She was in every respect a deserving representative. The following account is, taken from her funeral sermon, which was preached to a very large audience.

"Her amiable disposition and prudent conduct were evidenced by a constant regard to the relative and social duties of life. Obedient, attentive and affectionate towards her surviving parent, rendered more dear and venerable by age, she guided her feeble steps with care, and watched her declining strength with all tender sensibility of heart, with all that foreboding anxiety of mind peculiar to one who had derived so many superior advantages from her counsel and instruction. Towards every branch of her family she acted with an uniform regard to the virtuous admonitions which had been received from her youth. Kind, obliging, and assiduous as a sister, anticipating by her thoughtfulness, the wants, increasing by her lively turn of mind, the pleasures, or as occasion required, alleviating by her soothing accents of compassion, the sorrows of those around her. In her conjugal connexion, short as it was,—alas! very short, the same tender and affectionate feelings influenced her heart, and directed her conduct. The propriety of these remarks is best appreciated by that unfeigned sorrow and deep regret which her decease has occasioned. Her deportment as a Christian was no less conspicuous and eminent. It was regulated by principles, founded on very consistent conceptions of the Deity, and of his divine administration in the government of the universe. She embraced from conviction, and strictly adhered to the general doctrines of Unitarianism. The grand and leading truth of revelation, the unity of God, she maintained with firmness and integrity. The perfect and simple humanity of Christ was a consequence which followed of course. She considered the dispensations of Providence as tending ultimately to promote the universal happiness of the rational creation. The sentiments entertained by a mind naturally endowed with very strong powers, and considerably enlarged by reading, observation, and reflection, must necessarily have produced the exalted effects which we have seen in her conduct. In these sentiments she lived, in these sentiments she died, and died happy. Those who witnessed her last moments, witnessed a soul governed and actuated by the dictates of that system of religion which is the glory and boast of the Unitarian community. Her hopes of future happiness did not arise from an imaginary dependance on another's righteousness, but on the placability and goodness of that God who had been gracious to her during life. Sensible of approaching dissolution, with a mind equally calm and serene as in the full enjoyment of health, she sang the praises of the Most High, and frequently repeated this beautiful stanza:—

'I'll praise my Maker with my breath,
And when my voice is lost in death,
Praise shall employ my nobler powers:
My days of praise shall ne'er be past,
While life and thought and being last,
Or immortality endures."

Thus lived and died a virtuous, respectable, and useful member of society.

R. S.

Poole, May 16, 1813.

Mr. C. C. Rotheram.

Died, at Liverpool, on the 11th instant, in the 18th year of his age, **Caleb Charles**, the youngest son of the late Rev. Caleb **Rotheram**, of Kendal. His artless simplicity and innocent gaiety, ingenuous manners and amiable disposition, tempered by honour, virtue, and integrity, which qualities were addorned by a sedulous improvement of his natural endowments, gave high promise, (had his life been spared,) of future distinguished usefulness and moral excellence.

His saltem accumulem donis, et fungar inani
Munere.

Rev. William Lord.

Died, April 23d, 1813, aged 61, The Rev. **William Lord**, rector of Northiam, in Sussex, who was unhappy in being ever at variance with the inhabitants of the parish where he resided, respecting tythes, &c. yet of whom every Dissenter must confess, he was the gentleman and the Christian to them that differed from him in religious sentiments: in this respect he was an example to all around him; he abhorred a persecuting spirit on religious differences; never did he misrepresent any denomination of Christians, or hold them up to contempt. His discourses were rational; he was not a preacher of the universal restoration, though many years a believer in it. His further sentiments may be elucidated from the following anecdotes. Some years ago, questioning the young people before confirmation, he asked a girl how many Gods there were? To which she answered, One. He said there was God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost; and then asked her again, How many Gods there were? To which she replied, Three. No, he said, there was but one God; he thought the matter wanted a little alteration, for he did not understand it himself. Being once at his house, when a child was brought to be named, he asked the servant who brought it, Why she wanted it done? The answer was, The child is very ill, and my mistress is afraid it will die before it is named. He then said to the servant, You have made a mistake; it was the doctor you was to have given it to, for I can do the child no good. His servant once told him, a Mr. ——— had been seen since his death; the rector said he was very happy to hear of it, for he owed him considerable for tythe, and was in hopes he was now coming to pay it. When Mr. B—— a dissenter, died, his friends ordered the bell at church to go for him; the rector hearing of it, sent and stopt the bell; in a few minutes after I met him and thanked him for so doing; he said it was not out of disrespect to the deceased or his friends, or any that were dissenters, but those that dissented from the establishment he loved to see act consistently with themselves. Mr H. petitioned him to go to prayer with Mrs. H. who was on her death-bed, saying she had lived a good moral life: he further requested him to question her, How she stood in faith with Jesus Christ? This he refused, saying, He might make a bad job of that; so begged to be excused in this part, but would willingly go to prayer with her. I wish there were more who could see as the rector did on these subjects, and view a persecuting spirit as an untimely frost on the fair bloom of spring, or as the mighty tempest destroying every thing before it.

JOHN PLOMLEY.

Northiam, May 1st, 1813.

Mrs. Elizabeth Worthington.

March 27, died at Altringham, in Cheshire, aged 72 years, **Elizabeth**, wife of **John Worthington**, Esq. and daughter of the late Rev. James Hancox, of Dudley.

Elegance and amenity of manner, were in her united with an excellent understanding and fervent piety: and on all occasions, even the most trying, she evinced elevated and correct principles of conduct. As trifling circumstances best elucidate the character, a little anecdote of her shall be recorded.

During the American war, the affairs of her first husband, Mr. William Laugher, brother of the late Rev. Timothy Laugher of Hackney, becomingembarrassed, she thought it right to discontinue the charities and little pensions she allowed to many distressed objects, particularly to one poor family. Having still, however, a good garden, she made up nosegays of flowers, which being evanescent, she considered as not entrenching on the property of her husband's creditors, and gave them to the poor children to sell; by which means the accustomed relief was continued to the families for whom she was interested.

A pleasing instance of active and ingenious benevolence, and of scrupulous integrity!

Her manners to young people were peculiarly engaging and attractive. Many a boy, unconnected by relationship, has felt happy in being permitted to address her by the affectionate name of aunt. She "laughing would instruct," and exhibiting virtue and religion in cheerful and amiable colours, "allured" the youthful mind "to brighter worlds and led the way."

Her memory had been defective for some years, but her acuteness in reasoning on topics immediately present to her view, her apt, and sometimes witty, quotations from Pope and other authors familiar to her in her youth, and the naiveté of her manner, will long be remembered by her friends with admiration and regret.

She spent a long and chequered life with honour and utility,—regarded death with chearful and resigned serenity; her last words were expressive of the delight she felt in the prospect of re-union with her friends in a better state, and her last looks indicative of gratitude and affection to them for their unwearied attentions during a protracted illness.

A mourning relative sketches this brief but faithful memorial of his benefactress and his friend.

H.

INTELLIGENCE.

Unitarian Fund.

The Annual Meeting of the Subscribers and friends to the UNITARIAN FUND will be held on Wednesday, the 9th of June, when a Sermon will be preached in behalf of the Fund at the Rev. W. Vidler's chapel, in Parliament Court, Artillery Lane, Bishopsgate Street, by the Rev. Edmund Butcher, of Sidmouth. Service to begin at eleven o'clock. After the service the Report of the committee will be read, and the usual business of the society transacted, in the chapel.

N. B. The subscribers and friends will afterwards dine together. [For particulars of the dinner, see Wrapper, p. 5.]

On Whitsun Tuesday, the GENERAL ASSEMBLY of GENERAL BAPTISTS will be held as usual at Worship Street, when the Rev. Mr. Coupland, of Headcorn, or in case of failure the Rev. Joseph Dobell, of Cranbrook, will preach on the occasion.

The next KENT and SUSSEX UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION, will be held at the Unitarian Chapel, Tenterden, Kent, on Wednesday, June 16th, 1813. Service to begin at half-past ten o'clock. T. Blackmore, Jun. Secretary.

The Anniversary Meeting of the SOUTHERN UNITARIAN SOCIETY will take place at Brighton, on Wednesday, June 30th. The Rev. W. J. Fox, of Chichester, will preach the sermon in the morning: and there will be service in the evening. J. Fullagar, Secretary.

Manchester College, York.

The Annual Examinations of the Students of the College, will take place in the library at York, at the close of the present session, on Wednesday, June 30, and Thursday, July 1, and the York Annual Meeting of Trustees will be held in the evening of Wednesday, the 30th of June. The Trustees and friends of the Institution will dine together as usual each day, at Etridge's Hotel, York. W.

Penal Laws against the Unitarians.

[Our readers are probably aware of Mr. W. Smith's motion for the repeal of so much of the 9th and 10th William III. as relates to Anti-trinitarians. We here record the proceedings in the House of Commons on the motion, Wednesday, May the 5th.]

Mr. W. Smith said, he believed *no opposition* would be made to the motion he was about to submit to the House, and he therefore would not take up two minutes of their attention. The Act of King William, known by the name of the Toleration Act, denied to persons who disbelieved in the Trinity the benefit of toleration. An Act of the 19th of his present majesty, required only the general belief in *the doctrines of Christianity and the scriptures*; but it so happened, that though by the Act of the 19th it was not necessary to subscribe the Articles of the Church of England, professing the belief in the Trinity, the Acts of the 9th and 10th of King William were not repealed. By these Acts, persons who in writing or conversation deny the existence of any of the persons of the Trinity, are disabled in law from holding any office, civil, ecclesiastical, or military, on conviction; and if a second time convicted, they are disabled to sue or prosecute in any action or information, or to be the guardian of any child, and *liable to be imprisoned for three years.* The only object of his bill was to do away these penalties. He said the liberal Act which was passed last year was highly creditable to the liberality of the ministers of this country, and the times in which we live. The only question now for consideration was, whether those persons dissenting from the Church of England, should be still liable to the penalties of the Acts of King William. He therefore moved for leave to bring in a bill for granting farther relief to the different persuasions of Christians in this country, *who disbelieved the doctrine of the Trinity.* The Speaker observed, that the regular course was to move first, that the motion should be submitted to a committee of the whole house; which was accordingly done. Lord Castlereagh said, he certainly *did not see any reason to object to the principle of the bill.* When the bill was before the House, he would then be enabled to see if there was any thing in the mode of granting the relief liable to objection. The House went into a committee, when *leave was moved for and obtained, to bring in the bill in question.*

Description of the newly erected Unitarian Church at Philadelphia, with an Account of its opening. Feb. 14, 1813.

Of the design of a new Unitarian Church at Philadelphia, we have before given our readers information. The building was begun May, 1812, under the superintendence and direction of a Committee, consisting of Messrs. Taylor, Vaughan and Astley. From letters lately received, we extract the following particulars, which will not be thought trifling when it is considered that this is the first church erected avowedly in the New World for the worship of One God, the Father.

"The church is very handsome, without being gaudy. The form is octagonal. The pulpit and galleries are rather higher than was intended, but that cannot be of much consequence. The pulpit is circular, with a crimson velvet cushion, and crimson Persian curtains inside. Over the pulpit on a groundwork painted in imitation of marble, is this inscription from John xvii. 3.—*This is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.* The organ is 10 feet high, and 6 wide, with gilt pillars and pipes; the organ-loft with curtains the same as the pulpit. There are 72 pews on the floor, but none in the galleries, as there were so many benches belonging to the old place. The velvet and Persian was given by Mr. Vaughan, and Mr. Astley presented a very handsome clock. Mr. Lowe, the organ-builder, engaged several persons to sing, and most of the ladies went the evening before the opening to hear them rehearse. Mr. Rayner Taylor had the honour of opening the organ, which was excellently performed.

"On Sunday, Feb. 14th. the bell began at 10 o'clock and tolled 20 minutes, and then rang until half past 10, when Mr. Taylor struck up a voluntary on the organ. The Introductory Address was then delivered by Mr. Eddowes, after which Mr. Vaughan read the 96th. psalm, and a hymn was sung to the old 100th. Mr. Taylor then prayed, and another hymn was sung to London. Mr. Eddowes then commenced his sermon, from Joshua xxii. 22, 23:—he preached an hour, when, being fatigued, Mr. Taylor gave out a hymn, which was sung to Guildford. Mr. E. then resumed his discourse, and finished in 25 minutes, when a voluntary was played, during which a collection was made for the building fund. The last hymn was sung to Cambridge, and Mr. E concluded the service with the prayer and benediction.

"Mr. Vaughan performed the whole of the afternoon service: the tunes, Derby, 104th. and New Court.

"In the evening the place was excessively crowded; there were about 800 persons within, and 100 or 200 who could not get in. Mr. E. performed the first part of the service, and Mr. Taylor preached from Matt. xxi. 13, *My house shall be called the house of prayer*; the tunes, Bedford, St Anns, Falmouth."

Mr. Eddowes's was a high-toned Unitarian Sermon and is to be published.

"The three collections amounted to 205 dollars, and 40 Cts. which was far more than was expected."

The friends write in high spirits. The building cost (it is estimated) about 12,000 dollars, exclusive of the ground, for which, in the year 1818, are to be paid 7500 dollars. The Society subscribed among themselves, in the first instance, nearly 6000 dollars; a large sum, however, remains, as a debt on the new place. Our American brethren venture therefore to make an appeal to the liberality of their fellow Christians in Great Britain; and Mr. Joseph Priestley requests us to name the following gentlemen, as, amongst others, receivers of benefactions, how small soever, on behalf of the American Unitarian Church, the erection of which (to use the language of Mr. Priestley) cannot fail to have an important effect in a country, where the errors of the understanding are alone to be overcome, and where all sects are, in the eye of the law, on an equal footing:—

The Rev. J. Yates, Liverpool
— — W. Hawkes, Manchester
— — T. Jervis, Leeds
— — J. Kentish, Birmingham
— — J. P. Estlin, D. D. Bristol
— — T. Belsham, London
— — R. Aspland, Hackney

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

The Bible Society now occupies so much of the public attention, that every thing relative to it becomes of importance, and particularly to the members of the religious world. This Society, it is well known, is formed on the idea of uniting Christians in one body, for the promotion of religious truth, and this by means of circulating the Bible without note or comment. We have frequently observed, that it does not follow its own rule, inasmuch as it circulates King James's, or the vulgar English Bible, in which are many annotations; and, as the funds of the Society are large, and it contains many learned persons, there is scarcely an excuse for its not acting up to its avowed design, and publishing a correct translation without annotation, so that it may be a standard book for all parties of Christians to refer to, without offence to any. We had no doubt, when we first made this remark, that the reasonableness of it would be forced on its members by subsequent proceedings. But we have a singular circumstance to mention before we resume this point. To the parent society are attached several auxiliary societies, and at a meeting of one of them, a clergyman was called to the chair of the committee, which was met to arrange the business of the day, and previously to entering upon it he read a letter stating that one of the vice-presidents was accustomed to distribute *Unitarian* tracts with his Bibles, who being called upon in this manner, allowed the fact, and also that he was a Unitarian. Upon this the clergyman represented his feelings to be such, that either the Unitarian or he must quit the office of vice-president, and the company having declared very generally their opinion that their Society was formed for all denominations of Christians, the clergyman allowed the basis to be good, but denied that a Unitarian could be considered as a Christian. This point, however, he could not get established, and he left the room, thus abandoning his post as chairman, and his station as vice-president.

The charge of not being a Christian must seem a very absurd one to the body of Unitarians in this kingdom, who worship the Supreme Being under the peculiar title of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the very circumstance of distributing the scriptures of the Old and New Testament, unless there was an evident design in the distributer to counteract their authenticity by his tracts, is a sufficient proof of his design to promote Christianity. The term Unitarian does not in itself imply Christianity, since Jews are Unitarians; and there are many philosophical Unitarians: so that our title is, properly speaking, that of Christian Unitarians, and we are sorry to say, that we have seen reason, though there was none in this peculiar instance, for our brother Christians of other denominations, finding it difficult to separate the Christian from the philosophical Unitarian: the one, who looks up to Christ as the mediator between God and man, as the Saviour and Redeemer, and the other who considers Christ as merely a great moral teacher, to be ranked with other moral teachers, that have appeared in different ages in the world. Indeed if a minister, calling himself an Unitarian, should studiously avoid to speak of Christ as his Saviour, his Lord, his Mediator, and employ his time in such philosophical or moral discussions, as would be more appropriate to a college lecture room, than an assembly of Christian worshippers, there cannot be a doubt, that a pious hearer would find a difficulty in reconciling such a conduct with that of a man, who looks up to Jesus as the author and finisher of his faith, and hence may be imbibed the idea that Unitarianism is unfavourable to Christianity. Such an idea we know to have been imbibed; and we felt no small grief, that any occasion should have been given for the charge. A Unitarian will be zealous for the honour of his God, but this will not diminish his attachment to his Lord; and as a suspicion is propagated against us, it becomes us to be on our guard, that as far as respects us, who acknowledge one Lord, Jesus Christ, our brethren of other denominations shall know that we do not fall short of them in attachment to our common Saviour.

The Bible Society has given rise to another, under the name of the Meeting of Protestant Friends, for the circulation of the Scriptures among Roman Catholics, and the latter have formed a Society among themselves for the distribution of Bibles among their own members. The former society allows, that it expected the latter to distribute its own Rhemish version; for assuredly there could be no reason for their taking the vulgar version, made under the authority of King James, and his laws of translation. But here came the difficulty; both versions have their respective annotations, and some in the Rhemish version are offensive to the Protestant Society, which has expressed its opinion of them in the following resolution, namely, "that many of the notes attached to the Roman Catholic version are not only hostile to Protestant principles, but subversive of all Protestant churches." Hence co-operation between the two boards becomes impossible: but besides it could never have taken place, as the Roman Catholics do not allow of an indiscriminate circulation of the Bible. The Protestant Society has, however formed a Committee to consider the expediency of carrying into effect the original proposal to reprint the Rhemish version of the scripture, without notes, and to enquire particularly into the circulation of the Rhemish version in its present state, among the poor. The proposition of printing the Rhemish version, without note or comment, shews the necessity of printing the Protestant version in the same manner: and the proceedings of this new Society promise ample matter for reflection. It has corresponded with several eminent gentlemen of the Romish persuasion; and as it is not likely to be successful there, its efforts might, with advantage be directed to the Unitarians, to whom the Bible, with whatever notes and comments they please to add to it, will be very acceptable.

The above was collected from the Protestant account of this business, but the Board of Roman Catholics, in a meeting summoned to take into consideration the charges laid against their denomination, assure the public, that the representation, made by the Protestant Society, is founded on total misconception, for it never was intended to print the Bible with these notes, described to be so offensive to Protestants. They repeat their resolution of the general board, of the 9th of last February, which "decidedly disapproves of every publication, either illiberal in language or uncharitable in substance, injurious to the character, or offensive to the just feelings of any of our Christian brethren, with all whom the Roman Catholics of England sincerely wish to preserve harmony and mutual good will, in the spirit of Christian charity." Such a resolution as this ought to have satisfied the Protestant Society, at least unless they had proof, of which there is no appearance, that the Catholics had acted in a different manner from this resolution. Let each denomination maintain its cause with all the zeal it pleases; but of late years, in point of good manners, the Catholics seem to have had the advantage over the Protestants.

In the view of this agitation of the Christian world, we must not overlook a circumstance in which we may be supposed to be peculiarly concerned. This is the repeal of the Act which inflicts penalties on persons who disbelieve the Trinity. A Bill to this purpose is in Parliament, and met with no opposition on its introduction into the House; and surely the believers of the Trinity, if there are any really so in this kingdom, cannot, after the experience of the last hundred years, desire the continuance of an act, which we believe has not in any one instance inflicted any pain or penalty: two attempts, or rather one attempt and one threat, have been made, the first in the case of the celebrated Elwall, against whom an indictment was framed under this act: but when it came to trial both judge and jury united in scouting it, and casting some severe reflections upon the persecutors. This attempt was made by members of the established church; the threat of enforcing the Act was held out by some Dissenters, having at their head a Dissenting minister, who indicted, two or three years ago, a minister at the Cambridge assizes, exposing themselves to a jury of members of the Church of England, who were struck with astonishment at their persecuting spirit, and threw out their bill, Such being the case, it may be doubted whether the Act deserved any notice. An old maxim, *Malum bene positum ne moveto,* might be applied to this case. The Act itself as long as it stood in the Statute Book, was a monument of the fears of the Trinitarians for the validity of their cause, rather than an object of any dread to the Unitarians. But a popular writer has taken up the argument, and he resists the repeal of the Act, and lays down as a basis, that he who does not believe Christ to be God is not a Christian. The strain of his writing is, however, to throw the utmost contempt on the doctrine of the Trinity, and the Trinitarians will not be much pleased with their supporter. He is for no partial repeals. "I am," says he, "for a general Act, permitting every man to say or write what he pleases upon the subject of religion, or I wish the whole thing to remain what it now is." Every Unitarian would willingly accede to his general act; for we cannot desire for ourselves, what we would not grant to others; and we the more willingly would do it, as we are not in fear, like the Trinitarians, that our cause should be injured by investigation. Whatever may be the laws of any country, he is not guided by the spirit of the gopel, but by the spirit of this world, who takes advantage of them to deprive his neighbour of any civil right, or to subject him to any pain or penalty on account of his religion.

The bill relative to excommunication is now in its progress through the house, on whose part there does not seem to be any disposition to inquire into the nature of the spiritual courts by whom it is exercised, nor the cases to which it is applied. There was an intention, in the reign of Edward the Sixth, to set these courts aside altogether; but it is singular, that they have maintained their ground from their being, in a manner, out of sight, and the causes tried in them seldom becoming matter of public notoriety. A bill brought in by a judge cannot be expected to enter into the general merits or demerits of the case. Little more is done than to change the penalty of excommunication into that of contumacity; for the writ is to run *de contumace capiendo*, instead of *de excommunicato capiendo*. It is not impossible, however, that this act may lead to farther investigation.

A singular and very well-deserved mark of respect has been paid by the town of Leicester to its late teacher Mr. Robinson, testifying the high sense entertained by the town, of his merits as a citizen, a subject, and a Christian minister. A resolution was passed at a public meeting, in which the Mayor presided, for the erection of a monument, by subscription, to his memory, the surplus to be applied to the benefit of his family, and a committee was appointed for carrying this resolution into execution. In the address of the committee, Mr. Robinson is represented to have been the instrument of diffusing the true spirit of Christianity through the large mass of the population of the town and neighbourhood, his home, his town, his country, having been especially enlightened, fructified and cheered by the beams of this spiritual sun. He was the father and founder of many new and excellent institutions. There is scarcely a charity school, a benevolent society, or an hospital within his sphere of action, which does not owe its debt of gratitude to his alms or to his eloquence, to his immediate or to his more remote influence. We were not acquainted with this excellent person but by report, and all that we have heard bore the same testimony to his zeal and his philanthropy, and his Christian spirit. Our views of religion evidently forbid us to subscribe to several parts of his creed, which corresponded with that of the great bulk of professing Christians: but he added to it the zeal, which now in common parlance denominates a person to be evangelical, than which, indeed, a better title cannot be devised for, nor desired by a Christian teacher. The good tidings of the Redeemer's kingdom have long been proclaimed to man, and to diffuse its spirit is one of the noblest tasks in which we can be engaged. This spirit Mr. Robinson seems to have imbibed in a very high degree, and we hope and trust that his lessons, as far as they were agreeable to the truths of the gospel, will not be lost in the neighbourhood, in which he finished an earthly career marked out by so many excellencies.

An occurrence of a very different nature will give rise to different comments. It took place in Shropshire, where a clergyman of the name of Rakeshaw applied to Sir R. Corbett to disperse, what is called a conventicle, and to arrest the preacher, Mr. Wood, a carpenter, and any others who should manifest a disposition to riot. In consequence, a warrant was issued, and the constable, without shewing it, went up directly to Mr. Wood, then on his knees, in the act of prayer, seized him and dragged him some paces. For this the constable was tried at Chester, found guilty and damages of two hundred pounds were awarded against him. Application was made to the court of King's Bench, for a new trial, which was not granted; and Lord Ellenborough expatiated with great propriety on the unjustifiable conduct of the constable towards a person in the performance of his devotions, whether erroneously or not; and it is to be hoped that this example will deter that officiousness, which would molest a quiet, peaceable, worshiping society, and at the same time view with perfect indifference the mobbing and rioting of a multitude, collected for mere amusement.

The catholic bill made great progress in the Honse of Commons, and such an oath was formed, and such rules laid down, as denote the times of popery to be gone by; for the present race of Roman Catholics may be considered now as members of the Romish church, but entirely separated from the politics of the court of Rome. They are semi-protestants at least, and the late discussions will still more remove their prejudices. As to their doctrines, it must be continually enforced, that it differs very little from that of the Church of England, the offensive part of which, the damnation of all who are not within the pale of their creed, being maintained equally by both churches, and as the Roman Catholics can scarcely now be called Papists, no more can the majority of persons who go to church be called members of the Church of England. A transaction in Spain has been supposed to bear hard against the Catholics; but it strikes us in a very different light, it may shew the nature of the court of Rome and of priestcraft, but it does not involve in it the faith of a Catholic; a man may be a good Catholic and yet detest the acts of a popish nuncio. A nuncio in Spain was, it seems at the bottom of the opposition to the abolition of the inquisition, and endeavoured to creat edelays by his suggestions to the clergy. In these acts he was discovered, and the government issued a truly Protestant proclamation against him, in which it maintained the supremacy of the temporal sovereign, in every thing that is not spiritual. This is the more remarkable, as the head of the Spanish government is a Cardinal, and it shews that however bigoted a nation may be, its subjection to the Pope in spiritual concerns, does not alter their opinion of their civil rights, and it may be thence inferred, that an Englishman would certainly be as jealous of the interference of the Pope, in the concerns of this country, as a Spaniard in those of Spain. The House of Commons is very much divided upon this question, for after much battling, the Bill has received its death-blow, by a division on the question, whether Catholics should be admitted into Parliament, when there appeared, for the admission two hundred and forty-seven, against it two hundred and fifty-one: so small a difference shews that, if vulgar prejudices are not entirely, overcome yet religious liberty has made considerable progress.

The affairs on the continent wear a present at dubious, but most afflicting aspect. It has pleased Providence to permit the passions of men to continue to bring desolation on those regions, where civilization and Christianity were supposed to have fixed their seat. Germany has seen another of those dreadful battles, of which so many have disgraced Europe within the last twenty years, where hail-stones of a talent weight have fallen upon the earth, yet men have not repented of their sins, nor has the spirit of the Prince of Peace entered into the hearts of those who profess his religion, so that they should convert their spears into pruning-hooks, and their weapons of war into instruments of agriculture. The mighty hero, whose army was so wonderfully destroyed in the winter, has brought another into the field, and is now with it in the heart of Germany. The extent of its numbers cannot be ascertained, as it is his interest to swell the account at present to intimidate his adversaries. Scarcely had he joined his army, when every thing was prepared for an attack; nor were the confederate sovereigns behind-hand in their efforts to oppose him. Multitudes like the sand on the sea-shore were assembled on the plains of Lutzen, and a dreadful day was fought, in which fell to the ground between thirty and forty thousand of our fellow creatures dead or wounded. Both sides claimed the victory, and this might the more easily be done, as the battle ended only in the night: but the next days witnessed the retreat of the confederates, and the advance of the French. Another dreadful battle of the same kind is to be expected. The fate of Prussia is in suspence, but it cannot remain long undecided. A general spirit of revolt is said to have taken hold of the minds of the Germans, but as yet it seems to have been confined to the northern part; and Hamburgh, threatened by the French, has not yet admitted them into its gates, and remains under the protection of the Danes, fearful that if Buonaparte should succeed, it must be exposed to the utmost severity of his vengeance. The Christian mind turns with horror from these sights, looking up to Providence with resignation and patience, hoping for a speedy end to these calamities, but confident in the Almighty arm, which curbs the passions of men, and finally will convert them to be instruments of his glorious purpose, the establishment of a kingdom of peace and righteousness.

Russia has presented to us the detail of the number of carcases, that have been consigned to the flames or to the earth in the vast regions which were covered by them. Where is the man whose heart is not appalled by such a recital! Friends or enemies, they are our fellow creatures. May humanity be spared the recurrence of similar events, by more heroical designs entering the hearts of princes, and leading them to the true glory of rendering the earth a better habitation for reasonable beings. Sweden presents to us a strange picture of human politics. It is said, in this mutation of kingdoms, to be preparing to annex Norway to its dominions: and Denmark to have failed in a negociation with this country. Spain is still unsettled, but the French have been foiled under their best general, in an attack against the English army, and Lord Wellington is entering upon his campaign. The war there is of an inferior nature, as the real contention is in Germany, and on the approaching event seems to depend the fate not only of Spain, but of Europe.

The United States are beginning to feel the effects of war in the blockading of their ports; but are still not dismayed, and are preparing new schemes for a maritime warfare, and endeavouring to adapt the Congreve rocket to naval engagements. In the South, the army of Buenos Ayres has gained a victory over their Peruvian brethren, and thus strengthening their new republic. The mother country cannot assist its colonies, and the subversion of its interest in the south seems to be inevitable. The times are big with great events: but in the midst of these distresses from wars and tumults, the increased efforts to diffuse the everlasting gospel over the world hold out the encouraging hopes, that, when these storms are blown over, better days will spring up, and the seed now sowing and sown will hereafter ripen to good fruit. May thy kingdom come, must be still the fervent prayer, to the Father of mercies, of every true Christian

---

Erratum.—In the account of the division at Exeter, on the Catholic petition, p. 276, col 2, (middle) for "two to one" read—twenty to one.

THE
MONTHLY REPOSITORY
OF
Theology and General Literature.

No. XC. JUNE. [Vol. VIII.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Book Worm.—No. VI. *Conference between the Ghosts of Henry the Eighth and Charles the First.*

Sir, *May 28th*, 1813.

The late discovery of the corpse of Charles the First, which settles a point of history, as to the place of his interment, reminded me of a curious pamphlet, which has been long in my possession, and is, probably, one of the earliest dialogues of the dead, in the English language. It is thus entitled :—

A Messenger from the Dead, or Conference, full of stupendious horrour, heard distinctly, and by alternate voyces, by many at that time present. Between the Ghosts of Henry the Eighth and Charles the First of England, in Windsore Chappel, where they were both buried. In which the whole Series of the Divine Judgments, in those unfortunate Ilands, is as it were by a Pencil from Heaven, most lively set forth from the first unto the last. 4to. 20 pp. 1658. To this title-page is prefixed a *print*, from a wood cut. On the ground, amidst scattered relics of mortality, is a *whole-length* skeleton. Above, in compartments, are two erect figures in winding sheets, each holding a lighted taper. These were, doubtless, designed to represent the ghostly speakers in this sepulchral conference. On the title-page, as a *vignette*, is a death's head, surrounded by wings and the motto, *spes addidit alas*, of which I do not perceive the application.

The *Conference* opens with this surly demand from Henry:—"Say! who art thou that presumest by a sacrilegious impiety to disturb the ashes of a king, which so many years have been at rest?" Charles, "in a softer, but most doleful, accent," now describes himself, as "that unhappy King of England, the undoubted heir of 62 monarchs, [according to Buchanan, 108], who did wear the royal crown twenty-two years, and longer." This declaration produces a sarcasm from Henry:—"What you a king! Did you ever wear a crown on your head, who have not a head on your shoulders?" Charles piteously replies, "I have not always wanted a head, my subjects, wo is me, did lately bereave me of it." p. 5. On Henry's enquiring "what heinous crime" had led "to so great a violence," Charles replies, "I know not well what;" and then, not supposed yet to be aware of his company, he declares his innocence, as to various vices, "of all which, Henry the Eighth, his predecessor, is condemned to be guilty by all the world." p. 6.

Charles thus accounts for the civil war which proved his destruction:—"My father being dead, strange rumours were spread of it. Not long afterwards, I married with the Daughter of France, and in the beginning of my reign made two unfortunate wars. A Parliament being called at Oxford, [1625] I lost the love of my people for dissolving it, at that instant when the Duke of Buckingham was questioned for having a hand in my father's death. At this I perceived that the people did repine, but I was too constant always to my own counsels, and although many parliaments were afterwards called, I dissolved them all. This inforced me to put unusual taxes upon my people, by which, and by the entertainment of the Queen Mother, of France, (a lady most extremely hated by the generality of the nation,) I wonderfully increased their evil opinion of me." p. 6. The Queen Mother was *Mary de Medicis*, widow of Henry the Fourth. That intriguing princess had been driven out of France, by the more successful intrigues of *Richelieu*, and the hatred of her son, Louis the Thirteenth. She arrived in England in 1638, and remained "here about three years." Charles, according to *Oldmixon*, (Fol. p. 173), was accused of having "allowed her near 40,000 pounds a year, when *France* would not allow her a *livre*," and this when he "had other occasions enough for ship-money." Mary *de Medicis* largely experienced the mutability of fortune. During the long minority of her son, she had commanded the treasure amassed by her husband, and indulged her taste for magnificence. Yet, during the last ten years of her life, except the interval passed in England, she appears to have been, even in necessitous circumstances. Thus writes one of her biographers:—*La reine se vit obligée de fuir à Bruxelles en* 1631. *Depuis ce moment, elle ne revit plus son fils, ni Paris, qu'elle avoit embelli de ce Palais superbe, appellé Luxembourgh, des aquédues ignorés jusqu'à elle et de la promenade publique, qui porte encore le nom de la reine.—Quelle leçon'et quelle consolation pour les malheureux? La veuve de Henri le Grand, la mere d'un Roi de France, la belle-mere de trois souverains, manque du nécessaire et meurt dans l'indigence.* (Nov. Dict. Hist. 1772. iv. 362.)

On hearing Charles's confession of his political indiscretions, Henry, like *Satan* metamorphosed into an angel of light, makes this just observation,—"*The greatest prejudice that can arrive unto a prince is the loss of his people's love.*" He instances in his "niece, Mary, Queen of Scotland," who "lost the affections of that nation, and amongst other things, suffered for that indiscretion, by the loss of her head in England." p. 6. To Henry's enquiry why Charles was not buried with the ancestors of whom he boasted, rather than "interrupt *his* peace at Windsor," Charles replies:—

"I dying did desire to be buried at West-Minster, but my stars which did shine but cloudily and obscurely on me, in my life, were as inauspicious to me at my death. I suffered many things grievous to relate. At West-Minster I received my fatal sentence, where my predecessors were accustomed to be crowned. At Saint James I was kept in custody, a place much beloved of me by reason of my childhood spent there, and the innocent recreations of my youth. At Whitehall I was beheaded, the scaffold being erected before the doors of the court, and I passed through that place in which I was accustomed to be present at masks and shows; and at the entertainment of the ambassadors of foreign princes." p. 7.

Henry now declares himself more fully, and teaches his ghostly visitor that, besides some perversions of justice, with which he charges Charles, he is suffering a righteous retribution for the crimes of his predecessors. Charles, by no means, relishes this doctrine. On his asking, "Should a king suffer by his subjects?" Henry replies, "We deserve greater punishments, by committing greater offences. They offend against a mortal king, we, against a King immortal." p. 8. His enormities Henry thus enumerates:—"The spoiling of monastries, having overthrown 376, and with one edict taken away all their goods and lands, plundered and levelled to the ground about 1000 churches," taking "out of the church of Canterbury above two great chests, so full of gold and precious stones, that four men could hardly stir either of them." Henry adds, "After that I began to shew myself in my own colours, I was as greedy of blood as I was before of gold, and made a great slaughter of all ages, sexes and orders whatsoever, and for no other trespass than that they opposed my pleasure. Four queens that successively had been married to me, did lose their lives, either by the axe or by a grief as fatal as the axe. I proscribed two princesses, two cardinals:—I did put to death by the common hangman twelve eminent personages, twenty-two barons and knights, sixteen abbots and priors, seventy-seven priests and religious men and others of a lower rank almost not to be numbered." pp. 12, 13.

Charles, in his reference to the civil war, having mentioned "the Lord of Kimbolton," as soon as "King Henry had heard the name he fetched a deep sigh, and said, Ah! at Kimbolton, it was that the most excellent mirrour of her sex, and the example of all virtues, my first wife, Queen Katharine, died, whom I divorced from my bed, that I might bring into it Ann Bollen, an incontinent woman, whom, not long afterwards, being taken in adultery, I caused to be beheaded by the common hangman." Henry charges himself with having commanded the *Cæsarean* operation to be performed, in the case of his Queen Jane, "adding to the cruelty these barbarous and inhuman words,—that wives could more easily be found than children." I find Sir John Hayward, in "The Life and Reign of King Edward the Sixth," commenting on that peculiar circumstance of Edward's birth, though he brings no charge against Henry. Lord Herbert and Hume do not even mention the circumstance, and Burnet (H. R. ii. 1) controverts the whole account, on the authority of "original letters that are yet extant," which, however he does not appear to have seen.

The result of his story Henry is thus made to communicate;—"Not to speak of the torments which I do now endure; what pangs did I not feel within me while I was alive; being perpetually scourged with rods of knotted steel by the three *beadles* of Avarice, Cruelty and Incontinency. Being abandoned by all, I died without the communion of the church, repeating oftentimes in my last hour these words, *we have lost all*. Being dead, I had the same end as Ahab, and it is the more remarkable, because it was in the ruins of a religious house, for as my corps was on the way to be conveyed hither, the coffin of lead, in which it was put, did crack by chance, and opened. To soder which, a plumber being sent for, my corpse was set down in the said ruins of the house there. While the plumber was running from place to place, his dog, most greedily did lick the blood that issued from me; a revenge from God, for the effusion of so much blood which in my life-time I had spilled." p. 12 & 16. Lord Herbert gives no particulars of Henry's funeral, and this humiliating anecdote would scarcely have been preserved by a courtier. Yet he closes his *Life and Reign* of this prince, with a short but comprehensive sentence:—"To conclude, I wish I could leave him in his grave."

Lord Herbert remarks that Henry "had begun a fair monument at Windsor." He is made to say in this dialogue, "I commanded that a more sumptuous monument should be provided for me, than was ever raised for any of my predecessors, and as yet I have no monument at all, although of all the Kings of England, not one of them had three children that successively swayed the sceptre, but myself. But alas! I need not fear that I shall be ever lost in the memory of men. I have purchased to myself an everlasting name, by my enormous offences. All sorts of men do strive as it were in emulation, who shall hate me most. I am become justly odious to the Catholics, because I divided England from the communion of the Church of Rome. The Protestants hate me, because through all the course of my life I did pursue them with fire and sword.—All lettered men will evermore curse my memory, because I have utterly destroyed such excellent monuments of learning and antiquity that the Christian world, can hardly paralell. Finally, while I was alive most men hated me, all men feared me, no man loved me." pp. 15, 16.

To this Conference, *post funera virtus*, had been no unsuitable motto, for, besides the expressions of Henry's remorse, Charles is made to utter these good sentiments, "I would to God that flattery had never been heard of in the courts of princes. I would to God that I had never heard that we are above the law, and are to give an account to God only for what we have committed upon earth.—An incomparable scholar, and highly esteemed in the days of my father and Queen Elizabeth, hath left recorded, that 'God doth most for kings, and kings, again, do least for God.'" pp. 17 & 19.

Charles had admitted that by the "instigation" of *Laud*, he had shewn "more countenance to some practices of the Church of Rome," than either his father did or Elizabeth. On this Henry upbraids him with the folly of being *almost a Catholic*, adding, "it doth not suffice to sit down in the porch, unless you enter into the church," referring to "King Agrippa," of whom he says, "he is now howling with me in the kingdom of darkness." p. 19. The reply of Charles thus closes the conference. "I have bled enough already. Think not to give new wounds unto me, by striking at me in my religion. What the sacred authority of the word of God and the light of my own conscience hath convinced me unto. What neither the frequent solicitations of foreign princes, nor the hourly importunity of my dearest wife, could dissuade me from. What, dying, I commanded my children to embrace, I shall never, after death, be induced to retract. In this resolution I do expect the day of a joyful resurrection, the morning air of which I do already feel refreshing me." p. 20.

Such is the best account I can send you of this royal Conference, some passages in which might deserve the attention of any prince, *had he ears to hear* them, *in Windsore Chappel*, or elsewhere. The author of this pamphlet I have no clue to discover, nor is the design of the publication, if it were at all political, to me apparent. At the end are eight Latin verses, addressed *In malevolos hujus narratiunculæ, obtrectatores.*

To these verses are annexed the signature, R. F. followed by this translation;—

Detractor, tear not with a dogged tooth
These leaves, nor yet upbraid them with untruth;
Though counterfeit the bark without be found,
Know that the tree within is good and sound:
And what's not obvious to the outward ear
More deep impressions in the mind doth bear.
Then tax me not, that poet like I faign,
This story to its speaker truth will gain.

Cromwell died, September 3rd, in the same year with the date of this pamphlet, but whether before the publication cannot be ascertained. I have found no hint at the Protector's government, nor praise or censure of the *Commonwealth.* Charles is, indeed, made to justify the war against him, and the value of kings appears to be only estimated by their services to the people. The author, evidently thought more favourably of the intentions, than of the conduct of Charles, whom he makes Henry describe as especially punished for *his* crimes, being in the *third generation*, though "the most innocent" of his successors. This, indeed, is the doctrine designed to be taught in this Conference. The writer could not, I think, have been a zealot for the Reformation, as he has left the reputation, of Anne Boleyn entirely undefended, and has degraded, though not unjustly, the character of Henry.

The contriver of this Conference was scarcely a republican, but rather a friend to a well-limited monarchy, ruling only by Parliaments. In religion, he was probably a Protestant, inclined to a compromise with Roman Catholics. It is remarkable that he has, except in two instances, always used that description, though *Papist*, as a term of reproach, was then so common. Is it possible that R. F. may have been an *Alexander Geddes*, of the seventeenth century?

VERMICULUS.

Miraculous Cures by the Corpse of St. Milburg.

Sir,

Among the errors which have obtained currency in modern times, in consequence of the departure of men from the true Catholic faith, you must allow me to rank the opinion, that the age of miracles has gone by: and I doubt not but that all your *unprejudiced* readers will agree with me on this point before they have proceeded through many sentences of my letter.

We have been informed that on a late solemn occasion, when a certain august personage visited the mansions of the mouldering dead, chance directed his steps to the spot where lay deposited, in oblivious seclusion, the body of that holy and sainted martyr of blessed memory, King Charles the First. No remarkable appearance is stated to have distinguished his coffin from the others which tenanted the same chamber, and it was known only by the superscription:—but after removing the lid, such a wonder occurred, as ought to reduce to silence the tongue of every cavilling sceptic;—for when the physician in attendance, with all due reverence, raised the head of the royal sufferer, which his rebellious subjects had so wickedly severed from his body, a drop of his precious blood, which obstinate heretics might have thought the lapse of two centuries would have hardened into indissoluble crust, or amalgamated with its parent dust, dropped upon the hand that held the sacred relic! I do not know how many witnesses there were to this miracle, or whether there were any besides the physician and his royal master; but the fact was regularly announced in the public prints, and recorded with a plainness and *simplicity*, that can leave no doubt of its *truth*. Now, Sir, the miracle being thus proved, what I would next observe is, that we must not suppose such wonders are ever performed in vain; and from the analogy furnished me by the *well-authenticated* histories of the holy martyrs and confessors of former times which have been detailed by such able hands as Baronius, William of Malmsbury, Cressy and others of equal repute, wherein the merits of the saints, while living, and the virtues of their remains after their death, are faithfully set forth, I am induced to hope that some happy consequences will appear to have been effected on the bystanders, and particularly on one of them, by this wonderful event, and through the efficacy of the re-liquified blood of Saint Charles. No authorised account of any such beneficial effects has, indeed, been yet given to the public, but I take it for granted, we shall in due time be favoured with all the edifying particulars.

In the mean while, Sir, that those of your readers who may not be conversant in such matters, may know what kind of blessings they may *reasonably* expect from an occurrence so wonderful, I shall insert here an account of the discovery of the remains of another royal saint, though not a martyr, accompanied by a statement of the astonishing effects that were produced on the occasion. The history relates to St. Milburg, one of the "lillies of pure virginity," as Baronius beautifully calls them, "which adorned the Saxon churches in the seventh century." She was the eldest daughter of Merwald, King of Mercia, and abbess of a convent at Wenlock, in Shropshire, which she had herself founded. Though she had been held in high veneration during her life-time, through some cause connected with the turbulence of the age, the place of her sepulture was forgotten, and remained unknown, till the year 1100, when it was accidentally discovered. The particulars of this fortunate event are given by William of Malmsbury, in a passage which I shall insert below*, and which Cressy, in his Church History, thus translates. "St. Milburga rests at Wenlock: In ancient times her memory was celebrated by the inhabitants, but after the coming in of the Normans, by reason that the place of her sepulcher was unknown, she became forgotten. But of late a convent of Cluny Monks having been established there, whilst they were busy in erecting the fabrick of a new church, a certain child, running earnestly over the pavement, the vault of her sepulcher brok under him, by which means the body of the holy virgin was discovered. Which being taken up, a most odoriferous vapour, as of a most precious balsam, perfumed the whole church: and such a world of miracles were wrought by her intercession, that wonderful multitudes flocked thither, both rich and poor, in so much, as there was scarce room in the open fields to receive them, so strong a faith they had to find remedy there for their maladies. Neither did they fail of their expectation, for none departed away without a cure, or at least a mitigation of their diseases, and particularly the *king's evil*, incurable by Physicians, was, through the merits of the holy virgin, healed perfectly in several persons." —*Cressy's Church History, lib.* xvii. *cap.* 18.

On referring to the original, your learned readers will perceive that the whole of this translation is very loose and paraphrastic, but I shall object to its accuracy only in one particular, where Cressy appears to me to have mistaken his author, and that is, in rendering *regius morbus, king's evil.* It is true, indeed, that Celsus has used the words to denote scrofula, which was called the king's-evil, from the mode of its cure, by the touch of a royal hand, as has been well related by the Historian of Lynn, with whose interesting account you have obliged your readers. [viii. 5. 91. 232.] But the slightest reflection must shew, that the historian meant to designate here, not a malady cured *by* royalty, for that would not in this instance have distinguished one complaint from the other, but some malady *of which* royalty *was cured.* It were greatly to be wished, that he had been more specific in describing what this was: at present we have only to look for his meaning in the best interpretation that can be put upon his words. *Regius*, every school-boy knows, means *royal*, *kingly*, PRINCELY, for he finds these definitions of the word, in his Ainsworth, and the same high authority defines *morbus*, "any odd humour, unreasonable passion or vice:" hence *regius morbus* will be, any "odd humour, unreasonable passion, or vice," by which a prince or royal personage may be afflicted, and which may well be said to be "incurable by physicians." As then, Sir, the relics of a royal saint in former times wrought the cure of this evil, what may we not expect in the present day, from the relics of another royal saint, and martyr too, *should there unfortunately happen to be any evils of this description remaining among us to need the miraculous remedy!*

---

* Milburga apud Weneloch requiescit, olim ab accolis nota, sed post adventum Normannorum, dum nescitur locus sepulchri, aliquandiu oblivioni data. Nuper vero adunato ibi conventu monachorum Cluniacensium, dum inchoata novi templi machina, quidam puer per pavimentum consitatus cursitaret, effracta mausolei fovea, propalam corpus virginis fecit: tunc balsamici odoris aura per ecclesiam spirante altius levatum tot miracula præbuit ut catervatim eo populorum unde confluerunt. Vix patuli campi capiebant agmina viatorum, dum æquis umbonibus dives et mendicus se agerent, cunctos in commune præcipitante fide. Nec cassum eventum res habuit, adeo ut nullus inde nisi extincta vel mitigata valetudine discederet, nonnullosq. REGIUS MORBUS, medicis sane incurabilis, per merita virginis relinqueret.—Williel. Malmesb. in Scriptores Re. An. post Bedam, Francof. 1601, page 89.

T. R.

A Misquotation.

SIR,

Having lately met with a Review of "A Short Statement of the Scripture Doctrine, respecting the Unity of God, by John Campbell," in a Magazine published at Edinburgh, under the title of the "Scripture Magazine," I was particularly struck with an extract which the reviewer professes to make from Mr. Aspland's correspondence with Mr. Webley. "After observing," says he, (No. 53, dated May 1, 1813. p. 121), "that Mr. Webley had adopted new objects of worship, he proceeds, 'If an angel from heaven were to preach to me the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, and the incapacity or unwillingness of the Almighty to pardon sin, without full satisfaction, I should, as I valued my soul, *hold his doctrine* ACCURSED.'"—After which he draws a parallel between Mr. Aspland and a Jew, who would not believe Moses, if he had declared Jesus of Nazareth to be the Messiah, and adds some other equally irrelavent remarks. But the reader of this quotation, and of the remarks which follow it, will do well, before he admits their applicability, to examine whether the quotation be fairly made, and, for this purpose he will turn to the Monthly Repository, vol. vii. p. 725, where, after observing, that "Divine teachings are claimed by men of almost all sentiments, by the followers of Joanna Southcot more than by Calvinists, and by them more than by his correspondent," Mr. Aspland proceeds, "This assumption, therefore, goes no way in a controversy; the *only* proper question in which is, *what is the doctrine of Jesus? His word is spirit.* He teaches that God is One; that he himself is not God but man, and that God is a Father, and always acts a fatherly part towards all his children; and" (then he professes) "if an angel from heaven were, *in spite of* THESE *divine teachings*, to preach to me the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, and the incapacity, or unwillingness, of God to pardon sin without full satisfaction, I should, as I valued my soul, hold his doctrine accursed."

Here we see that the reviewer has chosen to leave out the introductory part of the sentence, which was necessary to the right understanding of what he has chosen to lay before his readers. From the whole passage it clearly appears that Mr. Aspland's first object was, to convince his correspondent, that the proper question to be examined is, "What is the revelation already given to all men, in the scriptures of truth, and to be learned from them by patient, attentive, impartial examination?" and not, "What new revelation any individual may expect to receive by an extraordinary divine teaching?" And then, after expressing his own full conviction, that these scriptures teach the absolute Unity of God, the proper humanity of Jesus Christ, and the placability of the Father of Mercies, he adds, (in language, I admit, which, though adopted from the Apostle Paul, I should not have chosen to use, because an angel from heaven never *could* contradict the clear doctrines of divine revelation,) "if an angel from heaven, *in spite of* THESE *divine teachings*," &c.—But the reviewer has thought it prudent to leave out this essential clause

The reviewer goes on to warn Mr. Aspland, and through him, no doubt, all *Socinians*, that "a man can understand nothing, except it be given him from above:"—a gift to which he, of course, lays claim.—Was it "given him *from above*," to *mis*understand and so grossly misrepresent an adversary, as he has done in the passage before us?

V. F.

Monuments for the Dead in Dissenting Places of Worship.

Sir,

Will you allow me, through the medium of your pages, to inquire whether it is, or ever has been customary to erect monuments or place tablets in memory of the dead, in Dissenting chapels. I have not seen any thing of the kind, in the few that I have had an opportunity of visiting, and I cannot help lamenting the deficiency. These tender remembrancers of our departed friends, can hardly fail to endear, and increase our veneration for, the place where they are presented to our view; and the contemplations which they are calculated to excite in our minds, must be favourable to the grand object for which such buildings are erected. There is something striking and sacred, even to strangers, in these memorials of those who *have been!* and I know not whether the habit of beholding such as must particularly interest them, might not be a check upon the unfeeling levity with which we see some young persons quitting, for a more showy and crowded scene, the place where their fathers worshiped.

That there is no burying-ground belonging to a chapel, appears to to me no objection, but rather to form an additional reason for a Dissenter upon principle, who is, in compliance with the common decencies of life, obliged to be laid in consecrated ground, and to have a service read over his remains, which declares him to die in a faith which he utterly rejects: all this seems to render it still more desirable that some memorial should attest the *truth*, on the spot where he was in the habit of supplicating the Most High, and where his family and friends still meet, for the same solemn purpose.

Whatever may have been the opinions of those reformers, who are said scarcely to have tolerated cleanliness in their places of worship, I think Unitarians can have no objections to the species of ornament which I wish to recommend: if they have, I should feel obliged to any one who will state them, for the information of,

Sir,
Your constant reader,
M. H.

The Dissenting Minister's Complaint.

MR. EDITOR,
Feb. 1, 1813.

I flatter myself that, amongst other good offices which you are ready to do for the religious public, you are not unwilling to give your assistance towards removing the grievances of a body of men, who have, indeed, the meed of honour granted them, but rarely that of profit. To make the ground of my complaint understood, I will proceed, without farther preface, to inform you that I am the son of a Dissenting minister, descended in a direct line from one of the venerable company of martyrs, who, on the memorable day of St. Bartholomew, evinced the power of truth and the low value at which worldly honours and profits are held by those who seek a kingdom which cannot be moved. Strongly impressed by the importance of Christian principles and their value to give dignity to the character of man and eternity to his existence; and gratified by the services he fondly hoped he had rendered the world by a faithful avowal of them and by the uninterrupted esteem in which he had passed more than a quarter of a century, among a numerous, a devout and an affectionate people, the good man believed that he could not serve his son better than by bringing him up to his own profession, that he might advance the good cause and enjoy the like praise and gratification. Accordingly, I was kept at a grammar-school, till I attained my sixteenth year, and then was sent to a Dissenting college high in the public confidence, which had given to the world many learned and useful ministers. Some friends of my father, who valued him for the genuine integrity and excellence of his character, but thought him a man of but little worldly wisdom, proposed one and another scheme of future engagement for me, which promised greater advantages and offered a better prospect of opulence than did the favourite scheme of his pious meditations. But in his eye the honours and the riches of the world were of small account; and he entertained no more elevated hope for his much-loved child, than to see him usefully employed in the work of the ministry, and successful in bringing souls to Christ: and the summit of his ambition seemed to be that, when it should please God to remove him to a better world, his son might fill "the venerable place," which "his looks and his lips had adorned" for so many years; and continue to enjoy, for as long a period as himself, the affection and the blessing of that Christian circle to whom it was his prayer that he might remain faithful and useful, even unto death. The good man's prayer was heard. He preached till his dying day: and when at length he had resigned the solemn charge of the care of souls into the hand of the great Shepherd and Bishop of them, it became the lot of his son to occupy his pulpit, and his task to tend the trees which he had planted, and water the seed which he had sown. It is with regret I add, not with the entire satisfaction that he enjoyed. I would speak with reverence of the office which I fill, and hope I shall not be charged with dishonouring it, when I make a comparison of it, with the situations in which other branches of my family are placed: I would speak with respect of the friends who venerated the father and, I believe, esteem the son; and I hope they will not be offended when I direct their consideration, and the consideration of Dissenting congregations in general, to a species of injustice, to which, I conceive, unintentionally no doubt, I am now exposed. I am aware that my lot is not a solitary one: I have many fellow-sufferers; and it is on their account as much as on my own that I am now induced to intrude upon your notice, and upon the notice of your readers, *the Dissenting Minister's Complaint.*

It has been seldom in the power of the parents of Dissenting ministers, to leave an independent fortune to their children. It has, therefore, usually happened that they have depended wholly upon their congregations for the means of supporting themselves and bringing up their families in the world. There was indeed a period, not very long ago, when it was practicable for them to do this with comfort and respectability. My father did so. His salary, and the salaries of other ministers, his friends, were adequate to the demands of the day. What he received fifty years ago was never less and often more than that which is paid to me at the present time: and a good custom prevailed in those days, which modern fashions have, unfortunately for us, done away; for scarcely a family in the place thought the accounts of the year closed as they should be, till an item was included amongst them of a useful present, either to their minister or to his wife and children. In those golden days, Mr. Editor, butcher's meat was three-pence per pound, bread not a penny, butter seldom higher than six-pence, and poultry and other articles of consumption of proportionate prices; which enabled my mother, who was a careful housekeeper, by the help of the substantial proofs of friendship which she received, not only to keep a well-covered table, and treat us with a good glass of home-made wine, but also to make a small saving at the end of the year, which she used to say would serve us on a rainy day. I hardly need tell you, that now the common necessaries of life are at triple the price I have stated, and that even our Christmas passes with but few tokens of the liberality of our friends.

I complain not, Sir, of any disrespect. I experience the same kindness that I always have experienced. The friendly salutation, the cordial shake of the hand, the tender inquiry after the health of my wife, and the apprehension least I should take cold on leaving their friendly roof on a winter's evening, are as rife as they were in the days of my father; and when I have been for a short time absent from home, my good friends seem much pleased, and congratulate themselves on my return. But I have long discovered that I could not go on upon the old plan, and must have some other means of keeping my family from want.

My worthy parent used to say, that a minister of the gospel ought to have no other employment than the care of his people; and should visit among them, and make himself well acquainted with the state of their minds, and their proficiency in Christian knowledge. I thought so too, and adopted this maxim of my father's, and continued for some years to act upon it; until I found that I could not live by visiting my friends, but must employ my time in gaining a little more money. And, although the education of youth is a task in which I was loth to engage, yet, as it was the only one which offered, any advantages, I intimated to my friends, the necessity of having recourse to it; and have, in consequence been debarred for several years from the pleasing and edifying conversations in which I had long been in the habit of indulging. In this I already feel a loss which my books and my family cannot compensate, even when I steal an occasional hour to devote to them. For, in truth, Sir, this cruel necessity of sacrificing the greater part of my time to teaching Latin rudiments and English grammar, has robbed me of the means I before enjoyed of making myself acquainted with men and the ways of the world; and of observing the influence of the temptations of life: it has stolen from me those sweet hours which I was once accustomed to spend, surrounded by my books, and conversing with them; or reviving, by the sight of the names lettered on the backs of them, those trains of thought which an Atterbury and a Clarke, a Locke and a Hartley, had first impressed upon my mind: and thus it has transformed me, from a student of nature and an observer of man, into a mere plodder in a day-school, in which the same dull round is daily gone through, my temper is soured by the perverse dispositions of my boys, and my best relief is to sit quietly down in the evening with my pipe and my cup of October. I am told that I am become more crabbed and hard to be pleased, since I have taken to school-keeping; and I am sometimes afraid it will have a tendency to make me view the human race through a false medium, and that the doleful lucubrations of Mr. Wilberforce will soon cease to be held by me in all the horror they now appear to deserve.

I hope, Sir, I am right in ascribing this sad change of my lot to necessity. The times are much harder than they were fifty years ago; and yet my worthy friends are so kind as to subscribe as much to the support of public worship as their fathers used to do before them. They have experienced many privations of the comforts of better times; yet have not reduced their offerings to the church: and the great rich men, who have sprung up in consequence of the change of system, act so handsomely by me as to subscribe as much as the old standards of the congregation. I have not a word to say of them in the way of blame. I only fear they forget, that, while they are obliged to give three times as much for the provisions of their tables, gospel food remains at the old price; and that, while every trade and every profession besides is in the receipt of a much larger quantity of money, in consequence of the low state of the circulating medium, the Dissenting minister has not the means of enabling him to go with a fair balance of advantage into the market. Even our respectable congregations seem to think they do enough for their ministers if they raise them a little more than a hundred a year. But, Sir, the plainest deductions of arithmetic will shew them that this cannot be enough.

Much do I wish that I could with prudence educate my son to the Christian ministry: it is my desire as much as it was my father's. But indeed, as his faithful friend, I am forbidden to think of it. And the present scarcity of well-educated ministers is likely still to increase, if some steps are not taken, by those who profess the Protestant Dissenting religion, to render the situation of their ministers more easy and more worth the acceptance of men of letters.

How fortunate is the case of the clergy of the Church! Their income, being derived from land, increases with the advance of the produce of the land; and, if our paper money should depreciate ten times more than it has, they are secure: because they will still receive their just proportion of the corn and the wine. But what is to become of us? Harder times are likely to make shorter salaries; and they will go on lessening, instead of advancing, as the price of every thing gets higher.

Let gentlemen, who live at their ease and roll in their carriages, (for some such there are still amongst us,) let manufacturers and tradesmen think as they will, or think not at all of the respectability and comfort of the ministers whose spiritual things they receive; they must soon abandon the religion which they profess to love, or have their pulpits filled by men, whose services will be irksome to them, or they must come forward in a more liberal, I will say in a more equitable, manner, and encourage the preacher to the performance of his duty, and parents to the learned education of their children for the Christian ministry, by giving more of their carnal things. Let them consider the actual price of the necessaries of life, and let them remember that a Christian minister, a man of character and of education, has a right to live in tolerable ease; and that he does not ask any thing unreasonable when he demands a stipend augmented according to the rise of the times. To such a pass is the injustice of some of our congregations now arrived, that I am acquainted with those who, because they subscribe among them a little more than two hundred a year, must, forsooth, divide that extraordinary sum between two ministers, and so keep them both in an honourable poverty! But what is that sum, what is double that sum, to compensate a man of sterling worth and distinguished abilities, and it is these they choose to engage, for the labour of his head and the price of his time. Would a physician, would an advocate think four hundred a year an equivalent for the services of his profession? And must a Christian divine have so low a value set on his capacity to do good, that, after a life of study in which he has inhaled the fumes of the midnight lamp, and perhaps drawn disease into his vitals, and has ransacked and perplexed his brain in order to set in order the valuable truths of a religion which has the promise of this life and of that which is to come, he is to be thought paid by a paltry pittance, which will barely keep his children from starving and himself from a jail?

But what is the general fact? Stipends have in most places lowered, as every necessary of life has risen in price; and still our congregations require men of education and of character to entertain and to instruct them, while they are luxuriantly seated in their quilted pews on a Sabbath. The salaries of excisemen and of custom-house officers have been doubled, because they could not live without it. And, while a government, oppressed by an incalculable weight of debt, have found it necessary to increase the pay of those servants, without whom their pleasure could never be performed, we have even heard the illiberal, the base insinuation thrown out, by some who pretend to an esteem for the Christian ministry, that, "they pay enough," and that "their ministers are as well off as others of the community." I have known the man, if I may dignify him by the name of man, who has evinced such feelings, who, with a furious profession of love for the simple unadulterated doctrines of the gospel, has withdrawn his paltry guinea, because his minister *toiled* for the means of a respectable existence, and pleaded for an apology that he would not keep him in luxury; and I have also known one who could spend scores of pounds on the fashionable education of a daughter, but could not afford to continue a small subscription to the church of Christ. Can such folks and the like of them, love the gospel with its sacred doctrines? Can they wish to see them spread yet farther and more generally known in the world? Do they recollect that miraculous gifts ceased with the apostles, and that the Christian labourer is, according to every principle of common honesty, as much worthy of an adequate hire, as any other human being? Or must we, unawed by that spirit of liberality, to whose dictates it becomes us in most cases to submit, reply to them as Peter once replied to a worldly-minded professor:—" Away with thee and thy money! Thou hast neither part nor lot in this doctrine."—(*Acts* viii. 20.—*Wakefield's Translation.*)

Let professors consider whether their religion be worth any thing to them: if it be, it must be worth a great deal. And let them determine whether it be necessary for their pleasure, for their spiritual improvement, and for the general welfare of society, that a set of men be educated in a liberal manner to give them private counsel and public edification; and let them calculate the reasonable service, as they calculate the business of their manufactories, counting houses and shops; and they will acknowledge the complaint is not unfounded, which is made by their faithful servant,

Your constant Reader,

A Protestant Dissenter.

On the Decline of Presbyterian Congregations.

April 24, 1813.

Mr. Editor,

Various opinions, professing to account for the decline of what have been usually, though erroneously, denominated Presbyterian congregations, have from time to time appeared in your valuable Repository. If the subject be not considered by yourself and your readers as already continued to a tiresome length, and you deem the following remarks worthy of the public eye, you have my permission to give them to the readers of the Monthly Repository. I have been induced to turn my thoughts to this subject, from a perusal of the two communications in your last number (pp. 183, 185); neither of which, in my humble opinion, points to the real cause of the lamented decline. Your correspondent, Mr. Henry Taylor, of Liverpool, attributes the decline to a want of attention in our public seminaries, in instructing the students designed for the ministry, in the arts of elocution. Now, I will join with Mr. T. in estimating to its full extent the utility of this branch of learning, in order to command attention and to give a powerful effect to the address of a public speaker. But I am not disposed to libel the understandings of the persons composing our congregations, by entertaining the idea that the charms of oratory, however alluring, are sufficiently powerful to overcome all predilection for particular sentiments and modes of worship. Nor can I assent to the opinion that a want of eloquence in our ministers has caused the decline Mr. T. laments. There have been, and still are, instances where our preachers have delivered their discourses in a popular and fascinating style of eloquence, to thinly scattered audiences, in whose ears have tingled sweetly the soft harmonious cadences of well-turned periods, flowing in a mellifluous softness from the lips of oratory; but which have left no permanent effects upon the heart or understanding.

I will also concur most heartily with "The Son of a Presbyterian minister," in lamenting the very limited and insufficient stipends, which in these expensive times, are raised for the support of an office, deserving to be placed in the most easy circumstances: but I fear the ministers of the gospel are not likely to have this cause, this just cause, of complaint removed, until those at the head of our national affairs become better Christians, and by pursuing the arts of peace instead of those of war, enable all ranks in society to feel less the pressure of taxation, of the high prices of the necessaries of life and of the decay of trade. There are, however, (and to their praise, be it said,) many individuals at this moment amongst those who have hitherto been styled Presbyterian ministers, whose connexions are the most respectable, and whose talents are equal, if not superior to those of any other sect, the established sect not excepted. These men have forsaken the riches, the splendour and the enjoyments which their talents and their connections might have secured to them in the pursuits of commerce, or the more lucrative professions, and, to their immortal glory, have entered themselves as the disciples and the ministers of the humble Jesus, preferring his service to all which the world is able to bestow. It cannot therefore be for want of talents or an independent spirit in the ministry, that Presbyterian congregations have declined.

The decline which has hitherto been gradually, but evidently, taking place, may, I think, be traced to a very different and far less doubtful source, than any which have been as yet assigned. It must have been apparent to every superficial observer, that with the exception of a few instances, the great majority of our congregations have remained totally ignorant of Christian doctrines. Their ministers actuated by a groundless, and, I may add, an unworthy alarm, have abstained from touching upon those topics respecting which the Christian world is divided. Fearing that if they were to make known the result of their own most commendable inquiries into the doctrines taught by Christ and the apostles, they might incur the risk of offending the prejudices of those of their hearers, who have contented themselves with adopting the creed of their forefathers, without attempting to establish its importance by impartial examination; such ministers have cautiously, and, in their estimation, prudently, avoided to instruct their flock on subjects of high and momentous interest, and which would have added force and intrinsic value to the moral and devotional discourses upon which they have judged it better only to treat. Thus their people have had no peculiar principles to which they were attached, they have not felt any real value which any one system of Christianity bears over another. From these causes, any trifling circumstance of pique, of matrimonial connexion, or of fashion, has induced them to withdraw, and to join in public worship with any other sect of Christians; and in some cases, so little have they learned of the reasons for our dissent, they have joined themselves to the established church.

But, I rejoice to say, that a more auspicious day has at length dawned. The labours of those undaunted, enlightened and indefatigable servants of God, who are now no more, in conjunction with those truly apostolic ministers who are still pursuing a similar course, have removed the drowsy torpor and dispelled the infantine fears which have so long impeded the progress of the gospel and have suffered error to stalk with hideous and gigantic strides over so large a portion of the Christian world.

The manly avowals of those who are proclaiming the results of their laudable investigations, have raised a spirit of inquiry through the land. Our ministers are daily casting off their slavish fears, and their hearers, catching a spark of the same zeal, are informing themselves upon the real meaning of scripture. By such proceedings a bond of attachment is formed. They learn to reverence opinions formed upon mature examination, and the result of conviction, and are no longer liable to be seduced by less important attractions, or to be tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine.

I trust, therefore, that in our Unitarian societies, we shall not have reason to lament the decline which has been so much regretted in Presbyterian congregations, but that notwithstanding the mass of misrepresentation and calumny by which we are assailed, our numbers will continue to increase. Nay, I am decidedly of opinion, that the very circumstance of Unitarianism being a sect every where spoken against, will be the means of spreading a Berean spirit through the whole Christian church, which will lead many from darkness to light, and who will be compelled by the honest convictions of their understandings to join our ranks. At all events our societies, be they numerous or otherwise, will be composed of persons who will be able to give a reason of the hope which is in them. I am, Sir,

A FRIEND TO THE CAUSE OF GENUINE CHRISTIANITY.

Articles of the Church, Calvinistic.

SIR, *Feb.* 17, 1813.

In Mr. Nichols's "Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century," (v. 359) are several letters from Dr. Richard Knight to Dr. Zachary Grey, a clergyman well known by his animadversions on Neal's "History of the Puritans," and his notes on Hudibras. In the following passage Dr. Knight expresses an opinion very opposite to that of a modern bishop of the same church, Dr. Prettyman Tomline. Dr. K. indeed agrees exactly with Toplady in his "Historic Proof."

> "I cannot but be of Mr. Neal's opinion, as to our articles. The compilers of them were certainly Calvinists, and the seeming latitude in some of them is more owing to chance rather than any design in them to favour those of a contrary opinion. Till about the time of Archbishop Laud the clergy were universally so. I had once occasion to consult all our authors of any eminence within a large space of time, till about 1620, and did not meet with but very few that had not been thoroughly tinged with very narrow notions relating to predestination, free will, &c."

The *partial* adherence to Calvinism among the early as well as the late Nonconformists is thus described.

> "I find among the Anabaptists, for a long period, there were some who opposed Calvinistical doctrines beyond any sect whatever, and they still continue so to do. The late ingenious Mr. Gale was pastor of a congregation in London, where they have always been great sticklers for the remonstrant prniciples. As far as I have observed, the Presbyterians are pretty lax as to the quinquarticular points, but the Independents otherwise; nay, Neal himself is not reckoned a Calvinist, at least not a strict one, by his own people."

This Letter is dated *Bluntsham, near St. Ives, March* 24, 1733-4. Dr. Knight was rector of Bluntsham. He is well known by his *Life of Dean Collett*, 1724, and the *Life of Erasmus*, 1726. The latter supplied *Jortin* with many biographical materials for his own Life of Erasmus. Dr. Knight died in 1746, aged 71, as appears by an inscription in *Bluntsham* Church.

SELECTOR.

Quaker Doctrine of the Trinity.

SIR, *May* 5, 1813.

Scarcely any thing manifests more plainly the latent, but growing, dissatisfaction with certain doctrines reputedly orthodox, among the thinking part of those who still profess to believe them, than the frequent attempts such persons make, to give them a more inviting aspect. These varying pictures are not only unlike each other, but have no real resemblance to the original doctrine of which they profess to be portraits. These modern sketches are of course denied by others to contain the leading features of those orthodox images, which they have been accustomed to worship, instead of the One only true God, as made known to us by Jesus Christ and his apostles.

Such appears to be the case with your correspondent A. B. who, in your last number, p. 307, under a profession of giving your readers "correct information" respecting "the belief of the Friends," has, in the commencement of his remarks, strangely, but I would hope inadvertently, misrepresented its object. He informs us that a paper inserted p. 110, of your present volume, is said to contain the "Quaker doctrine of the Trinity." Yet its title as there given is not so, either in form or substance, but "On the *Unity of the Godhead,* under the different *appellations* of Father, Son and Holy Spirit." And the paper itself retains nothing but the shadow of a modal Trinity, and that so faintly drawn, as not to conceal the Sabellian features underneath.

A. B. next tells us, that he believes "this paper is not to be found in any of their accredited authors."—Perhaps not.—It is, probably, however, "an original production," of an highly accredited member of the Society of Friends, who furnished your intelligent correspondent, N. C. with it, as an exposition of the faith of his brethren, at all events of his own. And it appears to me to be perfectly consonant to the doctrine of their most approved authors, as disavowing any distinction of persons in the Deity.

By substituting the editor's running title to the article in which the above paper is inserted, in the place of that prefixed to it by the writer, A. B. contrives to insinuate that the "doctrine of the Trinity" is esteemed by the Quakers, as an "important article of Christian faith."

How does this appear? Not by the paper A. B. objects to, as not having been written by an accredited author, nor by his extract from Sewel's History of the Quakers, especially if the context be considered, and the occasion on which this Confession of Faith was compiled and published, viz, "To manifest that their belief was *really orthodox, and agreeable with the holy scriptures.*"

Consistently with this object, its authors not only avoid all mention of the Trinity, but where they do not confine themselves to scriptural terms, they refer to the texts by which they supposed each tenet spoken of was supported. I may well add, that such a selection of texts as they referred to on this occasion, were never adduced in favour of the doctrine of the Trinity, upon any hypothesis. Yet among thirty or forty of these, there are two or three which are generally known by all competent judges to be corruptly rendered in the received version. These explanatory references to the authority of the text, A. B. omits. I give them as stating the doctrines in question, with greater precision and clearness, than the extracts he has made, can of themselves.

The texts intended by the writers to elucidate and support the first paragraph he has cited, are Heb. xii. 2. 1 Pet. i. 21. John xiv. 6. 1 Tim. ii. 5. The first of these texts represents "Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith," not as co-equal and co-eternal with God, the doctrine of the Trinity, but as enduring the cross, and despising the shame, on account of the joy that was set before him, and as being *therefore* exalted and rewarded, "at the right hand of the throne of God." The second inculcates the duty of the followers of Christ, "*by him* to believe *in God*, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory, that their faith and hope might be *in God*." No trace of a Trinity can I discover here. In the third text Jesus is described as saying concerning himself, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto *the Father*, but *by me*." This reference, I confess very naturally introduces the other text appealed to, which declares, with a precision and clearness that cannot well be exceeded, that "there is *one God*, and one Mediator between *God* and men, *the man Christ Jesus*."

The second paragraph may indicate a leaning towards the Sabellian hypothesis, but it contains not a word like the doctrine of the Trinity, although the noted corrupt text, 1 John v. 7, is referred to. The early Quakers, however, I may observe, could find no such doctrine even there.

The authors of this Confession of Faith, refer to Rom. i. 3, 4. and to Mat. i. 23, to explain the contents of the third paragraph. But these texts are as far from containing any thing like the doctrine of the Trinity, as any of the foregoing. The three next paragraphs in this Confession of Faith, A. B. passes over in silence, annexing an incorrect copy of that which follows. In this, the writers of it, on behalf of the early Quakers, express their belief in "the gospel of *the* grace *of God*." A. B. drops the three words in italics, and calls it "the gospel of grace," without saying, as our primitive confessors did, openly and explicitly, whence it was derived; that is, from the Father. And in proof of this tenet, they refer to Mat. xxviii. 19, a text which enjoins the duty of teaching all nations the doctrines of Christ, from the consideration that all the powers he possessed were *given* unto him.

In the next paragraph, these early Quakers confess their belief, that Jesus Christ "is the author of their living faith, in the power and goodness of God, as *manifest* in his Son," speaking in the present tense. This profession of their faith, does not seem altogether to please A. B. who represents them as having spoken in the past tense, "as manifested in his Son," as if they had been there, speaking of the person of Jesus Christ while on earth, as being in and of himself, "true God and perfect man." Yet it is evident, when this error is rectified, that they were in part speaking, whether correctly or otherwise, concerning the doctrine of divine influence on the human mind.

One of the texts to which they refer us on this occasion, is 1 Tim. ii. 5. This text describes, as we have just seen, God as one being, and the one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, as another. The others, John i. 1, 2, 1 John v. 20, and Rom. ix. v. say nothing approaching the doctrine of the Trinity, although they have been thought to favour the indwelling or Sabellian scheme.

The last paragraph, selected by A. B. from this Confession of faith, speaks, it is true, of divine honour and worship, being due to the Son of God, and that he is to be prayed unto, and his name called upon as the primitive Christians did, because of the glorious union of the Father and the Son. But the texts referred to, John v. 23, Heb. i. 6. 1 Cor. i. 2, Acts vii. 59, and John x. 30, are insufficient to authorize our addressing prayers to Christ, as the second person in the Trinity, as those who profess that doctrine frequently do. And these early Quakers themselves seem to have recollected before they completed this sentence, that prayer and praise to be really acceptable, should be offered up to God, in and through his dear Son," and that to such prayers only could a gracious answer be reasonably expected.

I will subjoin the paragraph which follows the last of those selected by A. B. in order to give your readers more full, definite and correct information of the belief of the Friends, as expressed in this document, than he has chosen to exhibit, concerning the person of Christ. As to the "Quaker doctrine of the Trinity," I much doubt the propriety of at all using the phrase, except it be to shew how far the Society have been from recognizing that tenet as an article of its faith. "We sincerely confess and believe," say they,

"That Christ's body that was crucified was not the Godhead, yet by the power of God was raised from the dead; and that the same Christ that was therein crucified, ascended into heaven and glory,[*] is not questioned by us. His flesh saw no corruption[†], it did not corrupt, but yet doubtless his body was changed into a more glorious[‡] and heavenly condition, than 'twas in, when subject to divers sufferings on earth, but how and what manner of change it met withal, after 'twas raised from the dead; so as to become such a glorious body (as 'tis declared to be), is too wonderful for mortals to conceive, apprehend or pry into (and more fit for angels to see); the scripture is silent therein, as to the manner thereof, and we are not curious to enquire or dispute it; nor do we esteem it necessary to make ourselves wise above[‖] what is written, as to the manner or condition of Christ's glorious body, as in heaven, no more than to enquire how Christ appeared in divers manners or forms[§] or how he came in among his disciples, the doors being shut[¶] or how he vanished out of their sight, after he was risen. However we have cause to believe his body, as in heaven, is changed into a most glorious condition, far transcending what 'twas in on earth, otherwise how should our low body be changed, so as to be made like unto his glorious body[**]; for when he was on earth, and attended with sufferings, he was said to be like unto us in all things, sin only excepted;[††] which may not be so said of him as now in a state of glory, as he prayed for,[‡‡] otherwise where would be the change, both in him and in us?—Fol. edit. p. 644.

Such a comparison as the foregoing, scriptural as it is, could hardly have been made by any consistent Trinitarian, but it is perfectly consonant with the pure Unitarian doctrine, as it is also with the concluding paragraph of this Confession of Faith, which was given forth to clear the Society of Friends, from the aspersions of George Keith, who had recently been ordained a clergyman of the Church of England, after having been for many years a zealous and eminent preacher among the people called Quakers. The writers of this paper, speaking of the great day of judgment, when *the Son of Man* cometh in his glory, say, "that this most glorious *heavenly man*, and *his brethren* that have been so much contemned and set at nought, should be thus exalted over their enemies and persecutors, in glory and triumph, *is a righteous thing with God;* and that they that suffer with him should appear with him in glory and dignity, when he *thus* appears at last:—God having appointed a day wherein he will judge the world in righteousness, by *that man* whom *he hath ordained.*" Ibid, p. 648.

---

[*] Luke xxiv. 26. [†] Ps. xvi. 10. Acts ii. 31, and xiii. 35, 37. [‡] Phil. iii. 21. [‖] 1 Cor. iv. 6. [§] Mark xvi. 12. John xx. 15. [¶] John xx. 19. Luke xxiv. 36, 37. and xxiv. 31. [**] Phil iii. 21. [††] Heb. ii. 17, and iv. 15. [‡‡] John xvii. 5.

Hence it appears that these primitive Quakers contemplated Christ, even at the day of judgment, as *a heavenly man,* and his followers as *his brethren,* alike acting under the righteous government of God.

The above confession of faith was signed by George Whitehead, Ambrose Rigg, William Fallowfield, James Park, Charles Marshall, John Bowater, John Vaughton and William Bingley, most, if not all of whom were approved ministers in the Society, some of whose discourses and prayers, taken in short-hand, are still extant, and afford strong evidence, that their faith and worship was decidedly Unitarian.

I fear trespassing too far on the patience of your readers, or I would annex hereto another Confession of Faith, which was presented to the Parliament in 1693, for the purpose of clearing the Quakers from a charge of having imbibed "some Socinian notions," but as this accusation, and *the manner of repelling it*, may require some serious notice, I must defer it for the present, and will now only express my fervent wish for the prevalence of our common Christianity in its genuine purity, without those sectarian mixtures, which have hitherto so much debased its spirit and limited its benefits.

I am, Your's, sincerely,
PHILEMON.

Mr. Fordham on the Clerical Character.

Sandon, May 1, 1813.

SIR,

The ostensible object of your Repository is the discovery and extension of moral truth, and, as a means to this noble end, you wisely recommend whatever tends to awaken and interest the mind of man, and to excite unrestrained investigation, fearless of consequences, or rather, conscious that the solidity of truth will bear the severest scrutiny. This is to do honour at once to truth and the God of truth. That we are all very ignorant of the extent of divine wisdom, ought to be admitted, and the more we know, the more, perhaps, shall be convinced of this aphorism. "When Euripho, the physician, was asked, Who was his teacher? he replied, Time. And the maxim of Solon was this:

With equal pace my years and learning go;
Knowledge but proves how little yet I know."

Agreeably to the spirit of your work, I have extracted from an eminent writer, the following passage, for the consideration of those who are willing to bow down their heads before the divine statue of truth. The writer attempts to show, that the different professions are conditions or situations of human life which are essentially immoral in their bias and tendencies. After observing upon the sort of character which the study of law and physic is likely to entail upon its professors, he proceeds to the divine.

"A clergyman is a man educated for a certain profession; and having been so educated, he cannot, without much inconvenience, exchange it for another. This is a circumstance indeed to which his pursuit is exposed, in common with every other walk of human life; but the evil that results to him has its peculiar aggravations. It is the singularity of his office, that his duties principally consist in the inculcating certain opinions. These duties cannot properly be discharged without a life of study. It is surely a strange and anomalous species of existence, where a man's days are to be spent in study, with this condition annexed, that he must abstain from enquiry. This is incompatible with any thing that deserves the name of enquiry. He that really enquires, can by no means foresee in what conclusions his enquiry shall terminate."

But, if he enquires, he will, perhaps, arrive at sceptical conclusions, respecting his former sentiments, in spite of the bias impressed by pecuniary considerations and the fear of losing his friends. "In *this case*, he must determine either to play a solemn farce of hypocrisy, or to maintain his integrity at the expence of an obscure and solitary existence." This, Mr. Editor, is a situation which no moral agent ought to be placed in. It is equally injurious to the progress of truth, and the virtue of man. Here is a situation which nips the disposition to free enquiry in its bud. But if we dare inquire and determine to be sincere, we do it at the hazard of losing our subsistence and the solace of our friends.

"The infidelity however of a clergyman, is, perhaps, a rare circumstance. It frequently happens that he lives in the midst of evidence and is insensible to it. He is in daily contemplation of contradictions, and finds them consistent. He reads stories the most fabulous and absurd with the profoundest reverence. He receives a system with the most perfect satisfaction, which a reflecting savage would infallibly scoff at, for its grossness and impertinence. His thoughts are under such perfect discipline, that not a doubt ventures to intrude itself.

"Another disadvantage, incident to the profession, is the appearance of sanctity. His sanctity does not arise immediately from spiritual motives and the sentiments of the heart; it is a certain exterior which he finds himself compelled to preserve. His devotion is not the result of devout feelings; he is obliged equally to affect them, when he experiences them the least. Hence there is something formal, constrained and artificial in the manners of a clergyman.

"A third disadvantageous circumstance arises from his situation as a guide and teacher to others. He harangues his auditory at stated periods, and no one is allowed to contradict him. He pronounces the prayers of the congregation, and seems to act the Mediator between the Creator and his creatures. He is placed as a champion to resist the encroachment of heresy and infidelity. He warns his flock against innovation and intrepidity of thinking. The adversary is silent before him. With other men I may argue; but, if I attempt to discuss a subject freely and impartially with him, it is construed a personal insult. Thus the circumstances of every day tend to confirm in him a dogmatical, imperious, illiberal and intolerant character."

I will not make any further remarks upon these extracts, but leave them to the cool and dispassionate consideration of those sincere minds, who feel an interest in the progressive improvement, the virtue and happiness of all classes of men.

"I am a man; and nothing is indifferent to me, that concerns the human kind."

"Let us go on to perfection."

Your's, &c.

G. G. FORDHAM.

On the Necessity of preaching against Political Immoralities.

"To give religion her unbridled scope."
COWPER.

SIR,

It has frequently occurred to me as a highly interesting and useful subject of enquiry, how far the ministers of religion are justified in so seldom entering upon the discussion of matters connected with politics in their discourses from the pulpit. I am aware that it has become fashionable to attach a degree of odium to those preachers, who venture, even by allusion, to meddle with our national affairs: but seeing the influence maintained over private morals by the examples and conduct of public life, it appears to me that no apostle of Jesus can be worthy of his calling, who, to avoid that odium, neglects so important a part of his duty.

It is not by any means my intention to call in question the propriety of the zeal manifested, among the sects, to disseminate the peculiar creeds which they severally profess; on the contrary, I am ready to acknowledge, that it is laudable to endeavour to impress others with a conviction of what we ourselves conceive to be important truths. But, I believe, it will now be pretty generally admitted that the *differences* of Christians are of infinitely less moment than their *agreements*; that the doctrines of transubstantiation, of original sin and of the pre-existence or divinity of Christ, (doctrines which may for ever continue to be maintained and disputed,) are unworthy to be placed on a level with those simple, yet grand and indisputable principles, which teach us to regulate our passions, to judge our fellow-men with candour, and on all occasions, "to do unto others as we would that they should do unto us." Now, while many preachers devote more than enough of the time of themselves and their hearers to controversial disputation, I know of none who, according to my judgment, enlarges sufficiently on these principles or, (which I think of still greater importance,) gives a sufficient latitude to the application of them.

Nor let it be supposed that I wish to see the pulpit used to promote the views of a political party; far from it; this would only tend to degrade the institution and, in many cases, to justify what it was erected to condemn. I am solicitous that the clergy should free themselves from attachment to party; that they should, indeed, be the ministers of Christ; and as such, that they should not withhold the censure due to those who violate his precepts, *to whatever party they may belong.* And this appears to me to be more incumbent on them, because I apprehend that many persons form their principles of political and private morals, on very different grounds: no one entertaining any value for character will gravely defend a neighbour in the breach of an ordinary precept; but say that it is the duty of our rulers *to do justly* and *to love mercy*, and we are presently told that "it may be very well *in theory*," or, "how can they, when they have such a *monster* to contend with?" Let the Christian preacher inform his congregation, whether such instructions were given to adorn our theory, or to mend our practice; and whether *we* are allowed to suspend their application, because others live in the violation of them!

"But," it will be said, "great delicacy must be felt with respect to a variety of topics, on which politicians are divided in opinion; and much difficulty would be found so to handle many of them, as to avoid an imputation of party-spirit." The Bible, I reply, is not the creature of modern statesmen; in preaching its doctrines you cannot, therefore, be *fairly* chargeable with party views; and as to imputations which the uncandid may cast upon you, they cannot be taken into the account, by Christian divines:—indeed many of you have already proved your disregard of them, by the spirit with which you maintain your obnoxious controversies. Now I do not understand why a delicacy which you overlook for the sake of *disputed articles of belief*, should be held in so much reverence, when you are called upon, by the daily open and abominable departures from moral principles, in themselves undisputed and universally acknowledged, to be of fundamental importance.

But you are anxious to promote the spread of your several tenets,—that your hearers should be well-grounded in their religious opinions; and here we come back to the point from whence we started, that our disagreements are of less consequence than our agreements, opinions about which we differ than principles on which we are all agreed: and, recollect, that without these principles, no one scheme about which you are so solicitous, is complete; nor can it produce its intended effect, unless they are, as far as possible, acted upon implicitly. It may be a very good maxim for an honest statesman, that

> "When vice prevails and impious men bear sway,
> "The post of honour is a private station,"

but I apprehend that a leader in the Christian warfare, should seek his post where vice most prevails, for if *he* shuts his eyes to the vices of a court, or to the growing corruptions of a state, what is to counteract them? What is to prevent them, under the combined patronage of rank and fashion, wealth and power, from insinuating themselves into the manners and habits even of your own flocks? Nay, has not this already taken place? and mean-while, have not your fears for their moral good, given way to fears of alarming popular prejudice, of injuring your theological disputations, or, perhaps, of being called "political parsons?"

I shall probably be answered, "this is scarcely a fair representation of the case; for though we certainly do not often refer to political occurrences, we frequently deliver discourses on practical morality, and on the dangerous consequences of vice: and having laid down the rules, it is for every individual to apply them for himself."

But will individuals make such applications for themselves? It unfortunately too often happens, that mere rules, naked principles, are not understood, or more correctly speaking, they are not felt, they do not excite. A lecturer on natural philosophy lays it down as a principle, that water will always find its level, but he does not stop here, he illustrates, he applies his principle experimentally to practice, he thus makes it understood, and indelibly fixes it in the remembrance. It is equally necessary for the preacher to illustrate the principles which he would inculcate by examples from life. Let us try this on the ground I am contending for. We must be honest and just;—and in all our dealings. Now suppose this applied to a duty which as citizens we are frequently called upon to perform;—we are on the eve of an election; and the preacher tells his flock that their franchise is given to them as a public trust, which they must discharge, as they conscientiously believe to be most for the public good,—that they are not to be influenced by any consideration of private advantage, or they cannot be honest and just to their country. In giving ear to this, would they be less open to admonitions on other matters? Could any harm result?

"And would you have us to degrade the house of prayer into a political club-room?" No, Reverend Sir, but I would have you to elevate your flock to the rank of men; I would have you teach them that they are not, during an election, to set at defiance the principles which at other times they profess to act upon.

"But we should injure the cause of religion, were we to meddle with such subjects." *Injure* the cause of religion! If it be the end of religion to reform the morals and to mend the heart, I ask, how it can be injured by your endeavouring to put a stop to practices, the effect of which is to corrupt the morals and to debase the heart?

"We should be thought to travel out of the line of our professional duty, and to take upon ourselves a business more properly appertaining to the legislature." But the legislature may not chuse to interfere; and is no effort to be made? Will you still withhold your exertions lest you injure the cause of religion? You will scarcely persuade yourselves that the cause of religion can be served by your remaining passive observers of the growth of this evil. Unless it be broadly maintained that public life is without the pale of religion, that politics and morality are unconnected, nay, that they are wholly at variance, I do not see on what principle those who have devoted themselves to the service of Christ, can regard the vices of the political pandemonium as sacred from reprehension. How large a proportion of human misery may we ascribe to the vices and crimes of statesmen! But the misery, which is the necessary effect of those vices and crimes, is not the only evil they produce. Let it be recollected, that statesmen are men of consequence, and that their example has a proportionate influence on all ranks of society. One publicly jeers at "old morality;" another denominates by the gentle epithet "misfortune," what we have heretofore considered as a base and scandalous crime; another contends for a principle, which is founded in injustice, as essential to the existence of our national honour. Each is suffered to pass without reproof, the ministers of religion are silent, and those who are not guarded by a strong and watchful principle, are left to infer, that such language, proceeding from such high authority, must be allowable *at least*.

In further illustration of my argument, I will cite a case not dissimilar from one which no long time since actually occurred. A personage of high rank and of great influence in the state, is the habitual slave of the meanest vices. A political writer, desirous of rousing him to a sense of his public duties, censures his course of life, in plain terms, and, in consequence, is visited by an information *ex officio*. The counsel for the prosecution describes the enormity of the libel; the counsel for the defendant appeals to notorious facts in justification of his client; the judge, the impartial judge, delivers a charge to the jury; without offering a single observation in extenuation of the defendant, he palliates the facts adduced in the defence, by suppositions which *might* make them venial; and he concludes that the writing in question must be a libel, because it is calculated to bring the personage referred to into contempt. When such doctrine is promulgated from the seat of authority, by a grave oracle of the law, where, I ask in the name of the persecuted authors of Christianity, where are the preachers of the gospel? Will they hold forth a similar shield for iniquity? Will they tell us that it is a greater offence to censure the vicious than to be guilty of the vice? that the censure, and not the vice, is calculated to bring into contempt? I protest, I know of no doctrine more detestable, none which has done, and is doing, more flagrant injustice, none which strikes so directly at the root of morality, none therefore which so loudly calls for the animadversion of our moral and religious instructors, who ought to bear in constant remembrance, that from their congregations may be selected the juries to whom such doctrine is addressed.

The maxim, that the pulpit has nothing to do with politics must, in a country, where the church and the state are so closely united, convey in the very terms a contradiction, which is frequently manifested in fact. The church, says the Guardian, "is the best handle imaginable for politicians to make use of for managing the loves and hatreds of mankind;" accordingly, we have our fast days and thanksgiving days specially appointed: the proclamations, indeed, tell us "to humble ourselves before Almighty God;" but what is the language of a large majority of preachers? Is it not calculated to keep alive the spirit of national animosity, to foster our prejudices, and to excite indignation at the conduct of our enemies, rather than penitence and humiliation for our own? And can it be maintained, that this is consistent with the character of Christian divines? It is assuredly their business to counteract such feelings, to teach us to love our enemies, and thus to promote the great object of their master, "peace on earth, good-will towards men."

If to maintain from the pulpit certain general principles were sufficient to keep in check the disposition to violate them, we should at least not have to complain of the indecency in profligacy, which is not only practised by political characters, but defended by their partizans. Charge my lord A. or Mr. B. with any act of corruption, you are answered neither by a denial nor by an acknowledgment of the offence; but by a retort on my Lord this, or on Mr. that, the supposed idol of the accuser. Can any thing more clearly evince the necessity for an interference *not now exercised* to rescue us from the trammels of party, from an attachment to men which exists in the very teeth of principle? And where are we to look for such interference? Where, if not to those persons who have voluntarily undertaken to promulgate the Christian religion?

On you then, the disciples of Jesus, I now solemnly call! Cease I beseech you to act under the influence of a prejudice by which your sphere of usefulness is so materially abridged. Ask yourselves, fearlessly and in the spirit of candour, if this duty belongs not to the calling you have chosen. Be the faithful apostles of Christ. EXTEND THE INFLUENCE OF HIS RELIGION;—connect it with the consideration of our national concerns, by a due application of his precepts to our national practice. Exhort us *daily, while it is called to-day, lest any of us be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin*; and while you proclaim that in *every* station and on *all* occasions, the principles of Christian morality are the best guide for our conduct, teach us, that if, as a nation, we countenance our public servants in the neglect of them, it will be in vain for us to look for an exemption from those evils which we may learn from the history of mankind have, sooner or later, uniformly fallen on the people who have permitted their rulers without remonstrance to pursue a career of iniquity.

A LAY DISSENTER.

Mr. Belsham's Reply to the Rev. H. Horsley.—Letter IV.

Essex House, June 15, 1813.

SIR,

The author of the Calm Inquiry has represented Bishop Horsley as borrowing nearly the whole account of his church of orthodox Hebrews at Ælia, from Mosheim's book, *de rebus Christianorum, ante Constantinum,* without sufficiently acknowledging the obligation. The bishop indeed allows, Lett. vii. § 5. that he had "first learned from Mosheim how to rate the testimony of Origen:" but as to all the other circumstances, as though he had acquired the knowledge of them, from his own previous investigation, he only says, "ALL this, I affirm with the less hesitation, being *sup-*

ported by the authority of Mosheim."

And in this attempt to pass off as his own, what he had borrowed from Mosheim, the bishop might possibly have been successful, had not Dr. Priestley, (who not being in possession of the Ante-Constantine History, had consulted only Mosheim's general Ecclesiastical History, and had not found there all the facts asserted by the bishop) directly charged him with *falsifying history*, and thus compelled the learned prelate in his own defence to reveal the whole truth.

This clear and distinct state of facts, not greatly to the credit of the renowned *giant in controversy*, naturally rouses the indignation of the pious prebendary of St. Asaph, who, in his usual manner, and with his usual success, attempts to vindicate the character of his right-reverend progenitor from having been a plagiary from Mosheim.

But first of all he begins, p. 570, with a frank avowal that he really knows nothing of the matter, and, consequently, that his testimony in the case is of no value. Hear the venerable prebendary's own words:—"I can only say it was not bishop Horsley's practice to put implicit confidence in any uninspired testimony: but, *I cannot affirm as an unquestionable truth, that on this occasion he did not deviate from his usual practice.*" This is very modest: and it is the more to be commended, because if the reverend gentleman had made the affirmation alluded to, it must be directly in the teeth of the bishop's own express confession, extorted, indeed, from him most reluctantly, in order to repel the heavier charge of having forged the history himself. "If Dr. Priestley had consulted Mosheim," says the wounded prelate, (Tracts in Reply, C. 2.) "he must know that these were Mosheim's assertions before they were mine." And, "He must know that I have added no circumstance to Mosheim's account, but what every man must add in his own imagination." So then it appears as clear as light, that the whole of the bishop's edifying history of the church at Ælia was borrowed from Mosheim, excepting a few necessary additions from his own imagination.

This frank and candid declaration of the bishop, however, by no means satisfies the worthy prebendary, who sets all his wits and all his logic at work, to prove that his right reverend parent is mistaken, and that he really did not copy from Mosheim, though he assures his readers that he did.

His first argument is, (p. 578.) that "the bishop does not infer from the facts stated by Sulpitius and Epiphanius, every thing which Mosheim inferred from them." But as the learned prelate was never accused of transcribing all that Mosheim wrote, this observation is irrelevant to the question.

"But what detection had the bishop to dread?" cries the reverend prebendary, "he expressly declared that Mosheim first pointed out to him the ground over which he afterwards travelled."—True. The bishop did make this acknowledgment. But, observe, it was only in self-defence: and after he had been accused of falsifying history and defaming the dead: then, indeed the bishop admits that he had followed the footsteps of Mosheim. And most grievously did the right reverend prelate rue, that he had ever listened to the advice of the learned Chancellor of Gottingen: for when he began actually to travel the road to which he was directed, he in vain sought for the objects which he was told that he would meet with, and was compelled to strike into a new and unbeaten path in which he bewildered himself in laborious and unsuccessful wandering, in search after that which was not to be found, and which did not even exist.

But though all this appears most evidently on the face of the bishop's own narration, his worthy descendant with the most edifying zeal for his father's credit denies it altogether: and with all the confidence of one who expects to be believed, he thus sums up his state of the case.

"In confirmation of the inferences drawn from the narrative of Sulpitius Severus, Bishop Horsley appeals to the same passage in the writings of Epiphanius, to which Mosheim had appealed before him. But he does what Mosheim did not do. He analyses that passage: vindicates it against the cavils of Dr. Priestley: shows the full force of the evidence which Epiphanius, in conjunction with Sulpitius, affords for the existence of a church of Hebrew Christians at Ælia: and the testimony of these two ancient authors he confirms by the testimony of Orosius and Jerome, to neither of whom Mosheim had made any appeal. He was not therefore a mere humble and ignorant plagiary of the German historian: but surely his inferences from the united testimony of three or four ancient authors cannot be entitled to the less regard for their being nearly the same, which other men, of such learning as Mosheim and Cave, had drawn before him." Horsley's Tracts, App. p. 580.

Very plausible indeed! We here find that the learned prelate, like Mosheim, takes Sulpitius for his text: compares and criticises Epiphanius: from the stores of his own erudition annexes the authority of Orosius and Jerome, and the inferences from this critical and original inquiry, by the greatest possible good fortune, turn out to be precisely, or at least nearly, the same with those which other men, of such learning as Mosheim and Cave, had drawn before him. And be it observed, that, according to the principles of episcopal logic, the "argument is not the worse for wanting truth, if the opponent is not sufficiently informed to detect the falsehood." Who then will presume, after this, to charge Bishop Horsley with plagiarism? One circumstance, however, is surprising: that the reverend prebendary does not, after the laudable example of his learned progenitor, enter a timely caveat against chronological cavils. But possibly he might think that the bishop's success in this manœuvre did not warrant a similar experiment. And probably the reverend prebendary judged the precaution needless, being pretty secure that the majority of his good-natured readers, particularly those whom it was most his wish, and perhaps his interest, to please, would, with great complaisance, take every thing for granted.

There are, however, some troublesome people in the world who are not so easily satisfied, and who have acquired a disagreeable habit of sifting matters thoroughly. Such critics will observe, that the bishop in his first publication, Lett. vii. §5. assumes a very lofty tone. "I take a bold step." "I tax the veracity of this Origen." "The fact is so,"—and "I am supported by the authority of Mosheim." But after having been challenged to produce his authorities, and accused of having falsified history, the learned prelate recedes from this high-flown language, this confidence of boasting, and in a very subdued tone, expressive of bitter mortification, he confesses, "they were Mosheim's assertions before they were mine: I added nothing but what every one must add to help out a broken story." Tracts, *ubi supra.* And instead of boasting, as the reverend prebendary does for him, of his own original researches and conclusions, all that the learned prelate now professes to do, is to clear himself of the imputation of "RELATING UPON MOSHEIM'S AUTHORITY WHAT MOSHEIM RELATED UPON NONE:" and "to state the principles which determined him TO ABIDE BY MOSHEIM'S ACCOUNT." Tracts, p. 407.

The truth is, that the learned prelate having inadvertently rested upon Mosheim's authority, where he thought himself quite safe, and having brought forward his history of the church at Ælia with much ostentation and confidence, after having been charged with forging the facts, found it necessary in vindication of his own character, to examine carefully into Mosheim's authorities, which, to his great dismay, he soon finds utterly incompetent to bear out his assertions. The passage from Sulpitius is admitted to be inadequate: and the reference to Epiphanius had no more relation to a church at Ælia than to a church at Canterbury. The learned prelate being thus grievously disappointed in Mosheim's authorities, is constrained to look out for others. And having first produced a sentence from Orosius, which, though represented by the reverend prebendary as a confirmation of Mosheim, the bishop himself prudently allows "to be a feather in the scale," he places his finger upon a passage from Jerome, upon which he chuses to rest the main stress of his argument: but which was never cited for this purpose before, nor ever will be again.

Of this curious passage, and of the argument founded upon it, some further notice will be taken in a succeeding letter. In the mean time enough has been said to vindicate the reviewer of the controversy in the Calm Inquiry, in having stated that the bishop, in his narrative of the "orthodox church at Ælia," borrowed the circumstances from Mosheim, without proper acknowledgment, and to help out the story, had mixed a little from his own imagination. All this the bishop freely acknowledges, though under the idea of vindicating his father's fame, it is contradicted by his son. But the judicious reader, whatever respect he may think due to the filial piety of the prebendary, will doubtless govern his judgment by the authority of the bishop.

The reverend prebendary takes great umbrage that the author of the Calm Inquiry should represent the bishop as *ignorantly* propagating a gross calumny upon the spotless character of Origen. Would he then wish to have it understood that his sainted progenitor gave currency to what he at the same time knew to be a calumny? What could the bishop's bitterest enemy report more to his discredit? But the pious ecclesiastic insinuates that the Calm Inquirer stigmatizes Bishop Horsley as ignorant *upon every question*, as a weak, pitiful, illiterate man. If the reverend writer really believes this to be the design of the Calm Inquirer, his intellect is to be pitied. If he knows that no such assertion or insinuation is contained in the work which he has honoured with his animadversions, whatever may be thought of the bishop, it is evident that the prebendary, at least, steers perfectly clear of the imputation of being the *ignorant* propagator of calumny.

The Calm Inquirer, in his review of the controversy, assigns as a reason why Dr. Priestley did not consult the book to which bishop Horsley referred, that Mosheim's Ante-Constantine History was a book "not very commonly to be met with in England:" and likewise that the bishop who had borrowed from Mosheim without sufficiently acknowledging the obligation, "might presume upon security from detection by the scarcity of the book."

Here Mr. Prebendary triumphs. He thinks he holds the reviewer fast: and he is determined to give him no quarter. He recurs to the subject again and again in order to blazon the reviewer's ignorance and his own superior knowledge. "Mr. B. says he, p. 571, represents a very common book as not easily to be met with in England." And again, p. 578, "the bishop must be very ignorant indeed, if he presumed on the scarcity of Mosheim's Book." And what proof does the venerable prebendary bring of his broad assertion? Why, truly, that the Ante-Constantine History was found in the Libraries of no less than two clergymen in Scotland. It should seem that in the estimation of this worthy divine of the English church no book but what is very common indeed can possibly find its way into the library of a clergyman of the Scottish establishment. The prebendary's clerical friends in the vicinity of Dundee will no doubt duly appreciate the politeness of the "stranger that is within their gates."

In the mean time allowing that this book was so common in Scotland, in the year 1812, that it might be picked up from a stall at Edinburgh or Dundee, and might even be found in a Presbyterian minister's library, it is not easy for those who are not so profoundly skilled as the reverend prebendary "in Aristotelian and Baconian logic," nor yet gifted with second-sight, to discover, how this proves that the same book must have been very common in England in the year 1787. The premises and the conclusion are at some distance from each other. And that the book is not at present very common in London is evident from the testimony of Mr. Vidal, who is now favouring the public with a translation of Mosheim's Ante-Constantine History; and who in his preface assigns this among other reasons for his undertaking. viz. "that the book had become EXCEEDINGLY SCARCE, insomuch, that although it was not unfrequently sought after with the most eager assiduity, a copy was rarely to be procured even for any price."

How profoundly ignorant then

must Bishop Horsley have been to presume upon the scarcity of Mosheim's book! And how very cautious ought gentlemen to be lest in their great zeal to proclaim the ignorance of others, they should unfortunately expose their own!

I am, &c.

T. BELSHAM.

JOHN MILTON.

Unus patronus bonæ causæ satis est.

Episcopius.

No. XXVI.

Petitioning.

Petitioning, in better English, is no more than requesting or requiring; and men require not favours only, but their due; and that not only from superiors, but from equals and inferiors also. The noblest Romans, when they stood for that which was a kind of regal honour, the consulship, were wont in a submissive manner, to go about, and beg that highest dignity of the meanest Plebeians, naming them man by man; which in their tongue was called Petitio Consulatus. And the parliament of England petitioned the king, not because all of them were inferior to him, but because he was inferior to any one of them, which they did of civil custom, and for fashion's sake, more than of duty; for by plain law (cited before,) the parliament is his superior.

No. XXVII.

Plain Writing and Preaching.

Having the scripture, so copious and so plain, we have all that can be properly called true strength and nerve; the rest would be but pomp and incumbrance. Pomp and ostentation of reading is admired among the vulgar; but doubtless in matters of religion he is learnedest who is plainest.

No. XXVIII.

Paul.

If he himself appealed to Cæsar, it was to judge his innocence, not his religion.

XXIX.

Protestant Persecution the worst of all.

How many persecutions then, imprisonments, banishments, penalties and stripes; how much bloodshed have the forcers of conscience to answer for, and Protestants rather than Papists! For the Papist, judging by his principles, punishes them who believe not as the Church believes, though against the scripture: but the Protestant, teaching every one to believe the scripture, though against the Church, counts heretical, and persecutes against his own principles, them who in any particular so believe as he in general teaches them; them who most honour and believe divine scripture, but not against it any human interpretation, though universal; them who interpret scripture only to themselves, which by his own position, none but they to themselves can interpret: them who use the scripture no otherwise by his own doctrine to their edification, than he himself uses it to their punishing; and so whom his doctrine acknowledges a true believer, his discipline persecutes as a heretic. The Papist exacts our belief as to the church due above scripture; and by the church, which is the whole people of God, understands the Pope, the general councils, prelatical only, and the surnamed Fathers: but the forcing Protestant, though he deny such belief to any church whatsoever, yet takes it to himself and his teachers, of far less authority than to be called the church, and above scripture believed; which renders his practice both contrary to his belief, and far worse than that belief which he condemns in the Papist. By all which well considered, the more he professes to be a true Protestant, the more he hath to answer for his persecuting than a Papist. No protestant therefore, of what sect soever, following Scripture only, which is the common sect wherein they all agree, and the granted rule of every man's conscience to himself, ought, by the common doctrine of Protestants, to be forced or molested for religion.

XXX.
Mr. Prynn.

A late hot querist for tithes, whom ye may know, by his wits lying ever beside him in the margin, to be ever beside his wits in the text; a fierce reformer once, now rankled with a contrary heat.

XXXI.
Reformation.

'Tis not denied, but gladly confessed, we are to send our thanks and vows to heaven, louder than most of nations, for that great measure of truth which we enjoy, especially in those main points between us and the Pope, with his appertinences the prelates: but he who thinks we are to pitch our tent here, and have attained the utmost prospect of Reformation that the mortal glass wherein we contemplate can shew us, till we come to *beatific* vision, that man by this very opinion declares that he is yet far short of the truth.

Now once again by all concurrence of signs, and by the general instinct of holy and devout men, as they daily and solemnly express their thoughts, God is decreeing to begin some new and great period in his church, even to the reforming of reformation itself.

For when God shakes a kingdom, with strong and healthful commotions, to a general reforming, it is not untrue that many sectaries and false teachers are then busiest in seducing; but yet more true it is, that God then raises to his own work men of rare abilities and more than common industry, not only to look back and revise what hath bin taught heretofore, but to gain furder and go on, some new enlightened steps in the discovery of truth. For such is the order of God's enlightening his church, to dispense and deal out by degrees his beam, so as our earthly eyes may best sustain it.

XXXII.
Reason.

I hold reason to be the best arbitrator, and *the law of law itself.*

It were a mad law that would subject reason to superiority of place.

XXXIII.
Sectaries.

I never knew that time in England, when men of truest religion were not counted *sectaries*: but wisdom now, valor, justice, constancy, prudence united and embodied to defend religion and our liberties, both by word and deed, against tyranny, is counted schism and faction. Thus in a graceless age things of highest praise and imitation under a right name, to make them infamous and hateful to the people are miscalled.

XXXIV.

Selden.

That all this is true, whoso desires to know at large with least pains, and expects not over-long rehearsals of that which is by others already so judiciously gathered, let him hasten to be acquainted with that noble volum written by our learned *Selden*, *Of the Law of Nature and Nations*, a work more useful and more worthy to be perused by whosoever studies to be a great man in wisdom, equity and justice, than all those *decretals and sumless sums*, which the *Pontifical clerks* have doted on, ever since that unfortunate mother famously sinned thrice, and died impenitent of her bringing into the world those two misbegotten infants, and for ever infants, *Lombard* and *Gratian*, him the compiler of Canon iniquity, t'other the *Tubal Cain* of scholastick sophistry, whose overspreading barbarism hath not only infused their own bastardy upon the fruitfullest part of humane learning, not only dissipated and dejected the clear light of nature in us and of nations, but hath tainted also the fountains of divine doctrine, and rendered the pure and solid law of God unbeneficial to us by their calumnious dunceries. (Works I. 324.)

GLEANINGS; OR, SELECTIONS AND REFLECTIONS MADE IN A COURSE OF GENERAL READING.

No. CXXIV.

Pope Innocent XI.

It is well known that this Pontiff favoured the revolution in England, 1688, and was the friend of William III. On this account, at the congress of 1690, the English minister joined with the others in making a solemn declaration, in which they protest before God, that their intentions were, never to make peace with Lewis XIV. until he had made reparation to the Holy See, for whatever he had acted against it, and until he had annulled all those infamous proceedings against the Holy Father *Innocent*.

It was a common saying among the non-jurors of that time, that the Pope was one of the *Innocent* causes of the revolution.

No. CXXV.

Quakers.

The Quakers in Ireland, says Mr. Wakefield, in his "Account of Ireland," just published, (Vol. II. p. 809.) are in number about 6000; in England, 22,000. For this enumeration he gives the authority of Mr. Thomas Shilitoe. He adds a curious reflection, *What a body of morality, benevolence, wealth, and useful citizens; their wisdom is exemplified by their having neither priest, lawyer or warrior.*

CXXVI.

Motive for learning the Catechism.

Mr. John Hales relates the following anecdote in one of his letters to Sir Dudley Carleton, from the Synod of Dort. The question of catechising was in agitation.

"Doubtless," he says, in the letter of 19–29 November, 1618, "the most effectual way of all the rest to bring young persons to learn their catechism, was that which was related by one of the Helvetian deputies. For he told us, that in his country the manner was, that all young persons that meant to marry, were to repair, both he and she, unto their minister, a little before they meant to marry, and by him to be examined how well they had conned their catechism: If they had not done it perfectly to his mind, he had power to defer their marriage till they had better learned their lessons.

"I was much affected," he adds, "to this course, when I heard it; and I thought that doubtless it was a speedy way to make all young persons, excepting myself, and two or three more that mean not over hastily to marry, to be skilful in their catechism. The synod shall be ill advised if they make no use of it."

Works, Glasg. ed. 1765, Vol. III. Lett. p. 19.

CXXVII.

Miserable State of the Arabs.

When Dr. Clarke, the Cambridge traveller, was at Nazareth, some of the Arabs came to converse with him and his party, who were surprised to hear them speak Italian, in which language they had been early instructed by the friars of the convent. Their conversation was full of complaints against the rapacious tyranny of their governors. One of them said, "Beggars in England are happier and better than we poor Arabs." "*Why better?*" said one of the party. "*Happier,*" replied the Arab who had made the observation, "*in a good government: better, because they will not endure a bad one.*"

CXXVIII.

Fishers of men.

There is a pleasant story told of him, who, from a fisherman, was made Archbishop and then Pope. While Archbishop, it was his custom every day, after dinner, to have a fishing net spread upon his table, by way of a memento, as he was used to say, of the meanness of his original. This farcical ostentation of humility was what, in those days, contributed not a little to the increase of his reputation. Soon after his exaltation to St. Peter's chair, one of his intimates was taking notice to him, one day, when dinner was over, of the tables not being decked as usual. "Peace," answered the holy father, "when the fish is caught, there is no occasion for the net."

No. CXXIX.

Royal Bounty.

The following is an extract from an authentic M.S. relative to the private expences of Edward II:—

"Item.—The 11th. day of March, paid to James de St. Albans, the King's painter, who danced before the king on a table, and made him laugh heartily, being a gift by the king's own hands, in aid of him, his wife and children, 1l. 1s."

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

Observations on Mr. Wakefield's Translation of Acts xx. 28.

> Vir bonus nec indoctus fuit—criticus non fuit, neque esse potuit, utpote neque—neque judicio satis ad eam rem instructus. Thirlby's Dedicat. to Justin Martyr, apud Porson's Letters to Travis. P. 274. Note.

I have, for some time, hesitated whether the above character of *Dr. Grabe* should stand in front of the following observations on Mr. WAKEFIELD's translation of Acts xx. 28, and on the *note* by which he justifies it. I have ventured, at last, to adopt it with two omissions; one of which refers to Dr. Grabe's acquaintance with the writings of the fathers, and is therefore irrelevant to the *learning* of Mr. Wakefield; and the other, consisting of the word *ingenio* only, the insertion of which would deny to Wakefield that which no considerate person would have the hardihood to call in question. As it now stands, it does justice to the *learning* of the late Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, while it disputes his claim to critical acumen and *judgment*. My opinion on such a subject is of little value. But I submit the following *proof* to the learned reader, without apprehension. It is founded on a single passage, but might be extended to no inconsiderable portion of the critical labours of the same author.

However, had not the interest of truth and pure christianity been, in my view, materially concerned in this discussion, my respect for the memory of this illustrious man would have prevented me from offering you the following remarks.

Often have I read over the note on Acts xx. 28, at the end of Wakefield's translation of the N. T. and every time, I think, with increased astonishment. I refer to the *text* which he has adopted, the *translation* which he has furnished, and the *justification* of both which the note contains.

I. The text adopted is the common one, the last part of which only deserves our consideration: ποιμαινειν την εκκλησιαν του θεου, ην περιεποιησατο δια του ιδιου αιματος. I believe that there is not now a shadow of a doubt of the incorrectness of this reading. It has been decidedly rejected by Griesbach, and the true reading has been substituted, for reasons that overwhelm all remaining uncertainty, given in his long note on the place, which I wish to see rendered into English, and published at large in your valuable Miscellany. Griesbach's reading, and I will venture to say the true reading, is, την εκκλησιαν του κυριου ην περιεποιησατο, &c. Even Mr. Wakefield, who adopts the common reading, was embarrassed, as we shall soon see, by the extraordinary expression, (του ιδιου αιματος,) his own blood, as applied to (του θεου) God. We might have expected, therefore, that he would have been led by that embarrassment to adopt a reading, (του κυριου) which is supported by abundant authority, and attended with no difficulty whatever. No, against so much evidence as Griesbach has produced, which could not, I think, fail to satisfy the English reader, if your publication should furnish the English version of the *note*, as above recommended, he has even angrily clung to the common reading, and had recourse to a translation of the verse, which is not a little extraordinary, and opposed by every principle of just criticism and sound reasoning.

The first reason for adopting the common *reading*, which, Mr. Wakefield says, induced him to change a former opinion respecting it, is, that " it is the reading of the Æthiopic version whose authority is with him irresistible on this occasion: See note xvi. 7." The note referred to gives no reason for this great reverence for the Æthiopic version, as might have been expected, but contains the affirmation that " the *united* authority of the Vulgate, Syriac, Æthiopic, and Coptic versions is, to Mr. Wakefield, irresistible;" with this addition that " the reader may see *something* to this purpose in his Enquiry, &c. p. 36 and 220." Really this is almost too ludicrous to be for a moment the subject of a thought. But we may not do amiss to say a word or two on this marvellous Æthiopic version whose authority is so irresistible: and to avoid all danger of reprehension, the authority of Porson, *haud ulli secundus*, are offered to the reader, which are at page 179 of his Letters to Travis. He observes that the origin of the Æthiopic version is very doubtful; it may have been made from the Coptic; it may have been deduced from Greek manuscripts: nothing is certain. Then, all editions of it are imperfect, and one accurately given from Æthiopic manuscripts is greatly wanted. Whatever, therefore, may be the merit of this version, in general, it can stand for very little, alone, as authority for a particular reading.

But this Æthiopic version appears to give *no countenance whatever* to the reading contended for. From want of acquaintance with the Æthiopic language, I am forced to trust here to foreign authority; and to Wakefield himself. Griesbach says distinctly, " Æthiops habet vocabulum quo semper utitur, sive θεος in græca veritate legatur, sive κυριος: neutri igitur lectioni favet." *The Æthiopic version has the word which it always employs, whether θεὸς, God, or κυριος, Lord, be read in the Greek verity (Text): Therefore it favours neither.* What says Mr. Wakefield to this? Gentle reader, these are his words: " which is infamously false." I wish I could drop a tear on the words that could blot them out for ever! But what reason does he give for this *mild* contradiction? " On the contrary, *as far as my recollection will carry me*, (This is criticism!) this translation (the Æthiopic) NEVER employs the word here introduced, but to signify the SUPREME GOD ALONE. See Castell's Lexicon in the word בהר." Most certainly, this assertion is good for nothing; it rests on the *recollection* of Mr. Wakefield, which may be safely doubted when it is brought to contradict the positive assertion of Griesbach. It may be even seriously doubted if it is not founded on Mr. Wakefield's *ignorance* on the very point which he has so peremptorily decided. I think myself fairly justified in considering Griesbach, *and* Wakefield, under *these circumstances*, as evidence that the Æthiopic version furnishes *no support whatever* to the common reading.

His next reason for retaining the common printed reading is not a little curious: It is, "the variation between the Syriac and Coptic versions." In the note on Acts xvi. 7, this critic had affirmed that the *united* authority of the Syriac, Æthiopic, and Coptic versions is to him irresistible. Now, the *variation* of two of them, if not of the three, becomes equally irresistible. I would allow something to their *agreement*, if the suspicion be not founded that their authority is one and single, and that it is, at all events, but a slight authority, whether single or double or treble. But from their *variation* I should draw a very opposite conclusion from that which Mr. Wakefield has deduced. I should conclude that the original Greek employed a word which might naturally give rise to the variation, which the word, κυριος, Lord, would easily have done, but the word Θεος, God, surely *never* could. This will appear more obviously from the nature of the variation pleaded. "The former, (the Syriac version) has *the church* OF THE MESSIAH, and the latter, (the Coptic) *the church of the* LORD." If κυριος had been the Greek of the copies which these translators used, this variation is indubitably accounted for: but Θεος could never have been in their text, at least not in the text of the former, if indeed they both made their translation from the Greek, which may be questioned. But what says Mr. Wakefield? "This want of uniformity excites in me a strong suspicion of interpolation, in consequence of the peculiar sentiments of the translators, or the authors of those manuscripts which they followed." Can such a critic be justly allowed the praise of judgment? What is the natural inference? Not surely that those translators or authors had delicate Unitarian consciences which induced them to reject such a word as Θεος, and to adopt such an inoffensive and choice word as κυριος. No proof whatever can be given of such a bias on the minds of these *ancient* translators, whatever might be said of *modern*, ungodly text-corrupters. This variation would have shewn, at one glance, to the eye of a true critic, what was the probable text from which they translated this passage. They cannot be said to vary, one from the other, more than might be expected when the same original was to be rendered into two independent languages. They both vary from the R. T. but the *greater* variation, *the Messiah*, gives all possible weight to the inference that Θεος was *not* the text used, and when compared together, both almost irresistibly prove that the reading *was* κυριος.

Such were the reasons that had sufficient power to command the mind of Mr. Wakefield: reasons, in one instance not founded in any thing but mistake, if not ignorance; and, in the other instance, totally demolished by the very premises on which they stand. To settle a text, let us no longer recur to the *judgment* or critical sagacity of Mr. Wakefield, whatever we may think of his ability to render the text which he may have preferred and adopted. His *reasons*, in this case, have now, it is hoped, been carried on the wings of the wind to the Limbo described by Milton, and the arguments of Griesbach may, as yet, be pronounced *irresistible.* Such has ever been the fate of interpolations and corruptions of the New Testament, which pious zeal has contrived for the defence of the orthodox faith. Wit and learning and sagacity have proved feeble associates. What must be their fate when they are deserted by learning and judgment and sagacity and even good manners and every thing but what would raise a blush on the countenance of the veriest Tyro in literature?

2. The *translation* of a corrupt text is of small consequence. But this of Mr. Wakefield deserves some consideration, because it may be demonstrated to be unwarranted by the *reasons* pleaded in its behalf, and because it furnishes a curious clue to the origin of his predilection in favour of the Greek reading which he has adopted. I refer now to the last words of the verse, *του ιδιου αιματος*, which are rendered, *his own son.*

Here Mr. W. begins to feel embarrassment, in consequence of his adoption of the reading (Θεος) God, before. The church of God which he has purchased with *his own blood!* He says very truly, " as this expression would answer no good purpose, and would unavoidably lead those unacquainted with the *phraseology* of those languages, (meaning, I suppose, the vernacular languages) into erroneous doctrines, and impious conceptions of the Deity, I could not justify myself in employing it in this place." To this puzzle has Mr. W. been reduced by resolving to read Θεος in his text.

Well, to prevent error and impiety, the words, *του ιδιου αιματος* must be rendered, not his *own blood*, but his *own son.* It is always laudable to endeavour to stop the floodgates of erroneous doctrines, and impious conceptions of the Deity. But let it be done by *pious* means and *unerring* implements. Of pious fraud no one can suspect G. W. But I fear he has been here sadly led astray by a too pious devotion to a misguided fancy.

3. The quotations used from the scriptures to prove that *blood* means *man*, are worse than trifling. They are contemptible. What we want is to see that *his own*, or *God's* blood, means *man.* Alas! in what a day of *criticism* are we born!

The quotations from classic authors and from a scholiast, shew little but that Mr. W. had read them, and could produce them. They are either just as apposite as those from the scriptures, and prove that blood sometimes stands for man, or they prove much more than Mr. W. would wish them to do, viz, that the blood of a God partakes of the divinity from which it is derived. They would, in fact, demonstrate that the blood, or Son, of a God is *not* a man.

How careful Mr. W. was, lest impious conceptions of the Deity should be deduced from the expression, *God's own blood,* in *these* languages, we have already seen; it led him to render it, *God's own Son.* But did it never occur to him that, if in Greek *αιμα* or (could he have found such an expression, which he has not) *αιμα του θεου,* was an accepted mode of describing those who had their natural descent from the gods, the same idea would be attached to it, when applied to Jesus Christ? All the instances produced in this note suggest a *natural* descent or affinity, and the blood of the gods were uniformly either *demi-gods*, or naturally entitled to immortality, and to a right to join the celestial feast. In all *those* instances, also, *αιμα*, blood, would admit of a *literal*, or almost literal, as well as a metaphorical sense, and a heathen could not be shocked with the language, in reference to the pretended offspring of their divinities, that *the blood of Jove or Apollo flowed in their veins.* I dare not with common decency, apply this to Jesus Christ, or ask an obvious question, which but to ask would offend the ears of all Christians, heterodox and orthodox.

Both these parties are equally concerned in this discussion. Indeed, it might not have occurred to the Doctors Davies, to the Henleys, and Bowyers, from whom Mr. W. confesses that he borrowed this curious idea, that it would offend the delicacy of orthodoxy itself to admit the consequences naturally flowing from the phrase *αιμα του θεου* never, in fact, occurring, in any of the authorities adduced. But as the expression appeared to countenance a favourite dogma, they may be pardoned for not being duly impressed by the consequences of their own admission. Something they seem to have apprehended, when they softened the inadmissible terms into the less offensive one of *God's own Son.* Our wonder, with respect to *them*, though, at first almost irrepressible, ceases when we consider how their conduct may be accounted for. They might love the object of their attachment more than they feared any evil arising from the means employed to promote it.

But what can be said of G. W.? Here is not an atom of sound reason in favour of his *text.* Here is not a grain of authority for his *translation.* He saw the danger and inexplicable perplexity that arose from his text, which reduced him to the subterfuge of glossing it over, by an unjustifiable rendering. All his preconceived notions might naturally lead him to prefer the only true and rational text: and yet he loses his temper with Griesbach, and hazards his reputation as a critic, beyond the most temerarious visionary that has met my notice. How can we account for all this? Culpable motives cannot be attributed to Mr. Wakefield. Alas! the motto to this paper, I believe, gives the true solution. G. W. wanted judgment; G. W. was no critic. On this account, fancy took the lead, and hurried him and his learning through all the bogs and quagmires of affectation, conceit and eccentricity. For the sake of the prettiness and glare of the wretched conundrum, *the Son of God*, by magic extracted from *το αιμα ιδιον του θεου,* he has given to the world a specimen of the most wretched foolery under the name of criticism that has ever disgraced a scholar.

Of G. W. I have the utmost veneration. His probity was incorruptible. His learning it is not for me to attempt to appreciate. With the *man*, however, I am not concerned in this paper, of whom I could say nothing but that which is great and good. Of his taste and sagacity and judgment, I have spoken freely, and leave to the reader to judge with what success. My object is *truth*, which I feared might suffer from the false conclusions and reasonings, if such they be, of such a man as Mr. Wakefield.

A learned friend has suggested that the true Greek reading may be αυτου and neither ϑεου nor κυριου. To this the abruptness with which *his* church is introduced, would be no objection, as by *him*, would be instantly understood Jesus Christ, whom it was not necessary formally to mention by name, to persons whose minds continually dwelled on him. Examples of this might be quoted. But whether such a reading could be established for text, I confess, is with me a doubt. Perhaps the gentleman alluded to may find leisure and inclination to enrich your magazine with a discussion of the subject.

PRIMITIVUS.

An early Christian Church at Rome.

April 30th, 1813.

Sir,

My former observations on the Epistle to the Romans,* were designed to illustrate the internal evidence of its genuineness. In conjunction with Paley's remarks, in the Horæ Paulinæ, and with the external testimony, they have long since satisfied me that it could not be one of the letters which, a considerable time before the end of the second century, were forged and circulated in an apostle's name. Subsequent inquiry has added to the strength of my conviction: and I am now more fully persuaded that the statements and inferences of Mr. Evanson cannot be sustained. However, as it is nothing uncommon for different minds to be differently affected by the same reasoning, I am neither astonished nor mortified at finding that I have failed to remove the doubts of your correspondent* O.

Whatever has the appearance of argument in Mr. Evanson's short critique on this Epistle, I have already noticed. For I cannot call *that* an "objection," and still less "his most capital objection," which is a mere assumption, which rests on the erroneous principle that *a writer's silence concerning a fact, amounts, of necessity, to a denial of its existence.*

From the history of the Acts of the Apostles "it is *evident*," says the author of the Dissonance, &c. "that when Paul arrived at Rome, for the first time, in the reign of Nero, there was no Christian church there."† This language is at least unqualified: yet Mr. E. instantly descends to lower ground; for he adds, "as indeed it is not at all *probable* there should have been."

Now, we simply learn from the account given by Luke of Paul's situation and labours at Rome that, soon after his arrival in this city, he *called together* the principal *Jews*, and informed them of the reason of his being sent thither as a prisoner, that, on a day fixed by themselves, he discoursed to them, with various success, on the evidences of Christianity, and that he dwelt, two whole years, in his own hired house, where he, without molestation, preached the gospel to all who were willing to be his hearers.*

---

* Vol. vii. 696—699.

* Vol. viii. 193—195. † 2nd ed. 308.

I ask, Sir, what in this narrative makes it *evident* that there was not now a Christian church at Rome?

It is perfectly understood that Luke's object, in drawing up his second history, was not to present the world with a compleat relation of the travels, labours and sufferings of Paul, but only to exhibit sufficient evidence of this apostle's faithfulness, zeal and courage in his ministry, and to shew, *generally*, in what manner and to what extent Christianity was published in its earliest age.† There are facts of which he takes no notice,‡ yet by an acquaintance with which curiosity would have been gratified. Shall we infer then from his omissions that, where he is silent, he means to intimate either a doubt or a contradiction? No history could stand the test of such criticism, which would go indeed to the overthrow of all human testimony: and a comparison of what Luke has said, and of what he has *not* said, with Paul's Epistles, will establish at once the credibility of the narrative and the genuineness of the letters.

Attentive readers of this book, will be sensible of the author's solicitude to represent the labours of the apostles in the first instance for the conversion of the *Jews* and afterwards of the Gentiles. In conformity with his practice, he enlarges, in his concluding chapter, on the pains employed by Paul for subduing the prejudices of his countrymen resident in Rome. Their answer implies their knowledge of the existence and the unpopularity of Christians: nor is it *at all* improbable that they gained this knowledge from what they had seen and heard in the city where they lived.

Two opposite opinions have been delivered in respect of the state of Christianity at Rome in the apostolic age. Some writers imagine that converts were extremely numerous there: others, that there were scarcely any, or, at best, that they were few and inconsiderable. The truth, I believe, is, they were flourishing in point of faith and virtue,* without constituting either a large or an affluent body. Nothing more is signified by the Epistle. Their knowledge and their goodness were their most honourable distinction. It was a distinction which, as we may conclude from similar cases in modern times, could not be unknown to their fellow professors of the gospel in distant regions: it was, in fact, a subject of notoriety, "throughout the whole world," that is, as every fair critic will interpret the phrase, the whole *Christian* world. But it was not likely to attract the attention of the mass of the citizens, and much less that of the imperial court.

"*It is not at all probable*," according to Mr. E. that there should have been a Christian church at Rome in the reign of Nero, "because Paul was the apostle particularly chosen and delegated for that purpose, and he accordingly first preached the gospel to the distant Gentiles, as recorded in the

---

* Acts xxviii. 16.

† Benson on the Epistles, vol. i. 570. Note.

‡ Lardner's Works, vol. vi. 145—156.

* Rom, i. 8, xv. 14.

Acts. What! Did *he* first preach Christianity to "the distant Gentiles" of Parthia and Media and Persia?* Or would "the strangers of Rome," on their return from the ever memorable festival of Pentecost, be silent on "the wonderful works of God?" Would they forbear to publish them? Or could they publish them without effect? The propriety of Paul's designation, as *Apostle of the Gentiles*, is sufficiently vindicated by the fact of his being commissioned more immediately to the Gentiles. It might be within the plan of Providence that the members of the church at Rome should be unable to rank themselves exclusively under the banners of either Paul or Cephas. If that church was rather watered than planted by an apostle, the most prominent claim of the Roman pontiff cannot be supported.

Your correspondent, Sir, who states what he terms the "most capital objection" of Mr. E. with more than Mr. E's perspicuity and force, is pleased to say, "There is not a hint given of his [Paul's] finding any Christian church in Rome, nor of his receiving the least attention or kindness from any Christian brethren in that city." Now, in answer, let me remark that the apostle *chose* to call together the chief of the *Jews*, by whom, in the language of his historian, are meant the unbelieving part of his countrymen, and that they were called together, for the purpose of his informing them that he had "committed nothing against the people or customs of their fathers:" information which it was not requisite to communicate to those of the inhabitants of Rome who already professed Christianity. To assert that "Paul did not receive the least attention or kindness from any Christian brethren in that city," is to beg the question. I have assigned a reason* for considering *the brethren* who went as far as Appii Forum, to meet the apostle and his companions, as *Christian* brethren. Of the validity of that reason I am satisfied: nor am I unwilling to rely upon it as decisive of the controversy.

There is a passage in the Second Epistle to Timothy (iv. 16), which I have sometimes thought more favourable to Mr. Evanson's conclusion respecting the letter to the Romans, than any on which he has insisted:—"at my first answer, no man stood with me, but all men forsook me." That the believers in Rome, of whose excellent qualities Paul elsewhere speaks with so much pleasure, should desert their friend and teacher in the day of trial, might appear not a little improbable. The difficulty vanished on my recollecting that when our Divine Master was arrested, "all the disciples *forsook* him and fled."

I am, Mr. Editor,
Yours, &c. N.

On the Genuineness of the Epistle to the Romans.

May 6th, 1813.

Mr. Editor,

The objections which one of your correspondents has brought against the genuineness of the Epistle to the Romans, (in page 193 of your present volume) seem to me to admit of a very satisfactory answer. Indeed, they have been very sufficiently answered, in common with those which Mr. Evanson made to several other parts of the New Testament, by Dr. Priestley, in his Letters to a Young Man. However, as this work may not be in the hands of many of your readers, I hope you will admit a few observations which have occurred to me from an attentive comparison of the history, as detailed in the Acts, with the Epistle, and which, I think, will tend to confirm and illustrate the genuineness of both.

---

* Acts ii.

* Vol. vii. 698.

Before I consider the main objection which Mr. Evanson has brought against this Epistle, I will take notice of several others, from which it will easily appear how superficial an attention he had paid to the subject.

1. Mr. Evanson says, in page 307 of his Dissonance, "In Romans xv. 5, we ascertain the time of Paul's writing this Epistle to be, when he was going to Jerusalem with the contributions for the poor Christians of that city, that is, in the reign of Claudius; and he says, that when he has performed that good office, he will come, by way of Rome, to Spain. Now, whoever has read with proper attention the history of Paul's travels in the Acts of the Apostles, must be convinced that Paul never had the least idea of travelling into Spain, and that he did not go to Rome, till, by the partiality of Festus to his persecutors, *he was constrained to appeal unto Cæsar*."

Upon this I observe, 1st, that before we can be *convinced* that Paul never had the least idea of travelling into Spain, we must be convinced that that apostle never formed an intention which his brief historian has not recorded in the Acts. Again, if Mr. Evanson means to have it inferred, from Paul's being taken to Rome by force, that he had not previously formed the intention of visiting that city, we must appeal to Acts xix. 21. "Paul purposed in his spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying, "After I have been there, I must see Rome also." —From the passage just quoted, we may easily deduce a mark of time which will shew, that in the date which Mr. Evanson has given to the Epistle to the Romans, there is an error of at least three years. He says that "it is ascertained to be written when Paul was going to Jerusalem with contributions, &c. *that is, in the reign of Claudius*." Now, Paul could not form the intention of going to Rome, mentioned (Acts xix. 21), until he heard of the death of Claudius, by whose decree all Jews were forbidden to come to Rome. But his journey to Jerusalem, with the contributions, described in Acts xx. could not possibly take place, according to the calculation of Lardner and others, earlier than three years after this time, that is, three years after the death of Claudius.

2. "I cannot forbear," says Mr. Evanson, "remarking farther, the inconsistency of this writer (which, indeed, must generally be discernable in all falsifiers), in making Paul personally acquainted with so long a list of members of the church at Rome, where he had never been, amongst whom we find the names of Aquila and Priscilla; of whom Luke tells us, that *about, or rather before*, the pretended date of this Epistle,

they had left Rome, being Jews, in obedience to an edict of Claudius."

"Rather before!" Yes, as much as seven years before: for Paul met with Aquila and Priscilla, lately come from Italy, in his first visit to Corinth, in the year 51 (see Lardner vi. p. 280), and the period to which Mr. Evanson ascribes the Epistle, is proved from the Acts, or from other Epistles, to be in the spring of the year 58. There is, surely, in this interval, time enough for a pretty long residence of these exemplary Christians at Ephesus, (whither they accompanied Paul, Acts, xviii. 18,) and a subsequent return to Rome, before Paul wrote this Epistle. It is certainly very conceivable, that Aquila and Priscilla, having been forced to leave Rome suddenly, might have reasons for returning to it, as soon as the death of Claudius permitted them. Now he died October 13, A. D. 54. I wonder it did not occur to Mr. Evanson, that the writer of this Epistle, (supposing it to be spurious,) must have been a bungler indeed, if he fell into the palpable and manifest absurdity of making Paul personally acquainted with persons whom he had never seen; and representing Paul as desirous to go to Rome, at the very time when it was not safe for any Jew to be in Rome. The reason why Paul might be acquainted with many persons at Rome, without having been there, will appear when we answer

The 3d objection of Mr. Evanson to this Epistle, which seems to have much weight with your correspondent. I shall give it in Mr. Evanson's own words. "From the history in the Acts, it is evident that when Paul arrived at Rome for the first time, in the reign of Nero, there was no Christian Church there, as, indeed, it is not at all probable there should have been, because Paul was the Apostle particularly chosen and delegated for that purpose, and he accordingly first preached the gospel to the distant Gentiles, as recorded in the Acts. From the same history there is every reason to believe, that the gospel had never been preached beyond the limits of Asia, till Paul was, in a vision, admonished to go into Macedonia, and from thence into Greece; yet Paul is made to write this epistle to the Christian converts at Rome, whilst he was preaching the gospel at Corinth. Who then was that other apostle to the Gentiles, who so far preceded Paul, as already to have reached Rome, and to have founded a church there, early enough for its being 'spoken of throughout the whole world,' when Paul, in the execution of the commission miraculously given to him by Christ himself, had advanced no farther than Macedonia and Greece? Besides, from the last chapter of Acts it appears, incontestably, that they were not Christians but Jews, who met Paul at Appii Forum, that his first step, when he arrived at Rome, was to call the Jews resident there, and exculpate himself for having appealed to the Emperor, that those Jews, far from knowing the gospel to have been already preached and received at Rome, declared themselves totally ignorant concerning it, except that it was every where spoken against, and were desirous to be informed of its doctrines by him, which after he had done, upon their disagreeing and leaving him he said, '*Be it known* to you that the salvation of God is sent (that is, the gospel is to be preached) to the Gentiles, and that they will hear it.' Whereas, according to this epistle, it must have *been known* already to the Jews of Rome, that the gospel *had been* preached to the Gentiles of that city, and that they *had received* it."

There is, I allow, an apparent contradiction between the epistle and the xxviiith chapter of Acts; which if a real one, would shew the writer of the epistle to be a clumsy forger; but if it vanishes on a more accurate examination, it becomes a striking, because, evidently, an undesigned coincidence. I have no doubt that the gospel had never been preached at Rome by any apostle or apostolic person till Paul arrived there a prisoner. Neither does the epistle make any such assertion; indeed, we may conclude the contrary from the language which it uses. In the xvth chapter, 19th and 20th verses, Paul says, "From Jerusalem, and round about to Illyricum, I have preached the gospel of Christ, earnestly striving, however, to preach the gospel in this manner, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation." "On which account, having often been hindered, I have had a great desire for these many years to come to you."

It may not be immediately apparent, how under these circumstances there could be a Christian church at Rome. This "falsifier of the second century" seems to have laid himself open very unnecessarily to objections. He seems to have little concern to explain away difficulties. and throws in circumstances which tend only to perplex his readers. But let us examine the matter a little; perhaps he is not such a fool as we take him for.

We know that the Jews, even when Jerusalem was existing and Judea inhabited by them, had always a great deal of that wandering spirit which now distinguishes them. By the history in the Acts we find that they had synagogues in almost every town of Asia Minor and Greece, and probably of Italy. The spirit of their character, if not of their institutions, inclined them to commerce and trade, which amongst the Romans were accounted mean and servile occupations; the Jews were therefore the merchants and tradesmen of the whole civilized world. It may easily be conceived how numerous a body of Jews there must have been at Rome. So respectable a body were they, that various edicts were made in favour of the Jewish people; and so wealthy were they that an edict was issued on purpose to regulate and protect the offerings sent by them to Jerusalem. It is probable that the wealth and property of the Jews of Rome was greater than that of Jerusalem. And the Jewish population at Rome must have borne some considerable proportion to the ordinary population at Jerusalem.—These two great cities were the foci of that large tract of countries through which this eccentric people were scattered; and they continually drew to themselves a large proportion of the whole Jewish population. From this constant resort to Jerusalem for religious, to Rome for mercantile purposes, it is evident, that many Jews of Rome might be converted to Christianity, without any Apostle having ever visited them; and that these might very naturally unite and form a church at Rome, without attracting the attention of the great body of Jews at Rome, who remained unbelieving. But we are able to account for a church at Rome at this period, and for Paul's acquaintance with individuals belonging to it, in a still more satisfactory manner. The edict of Claudius, by which all Jews were banished from Rome, caused a very extraordinary resort of Jews, settled in that city, to every other part of the empire. Those who were "chief Jews," (See Acts xxviii. 17,) and had connections and rank in Jerusalem would of course resort thither, and would very probably never hear more of Christianity than that it was a "sect every where spoken against." But those who had been engaged in an active trade, and who depended upon manufactures, &c. for their livelihood, would of course settle in other mercantile cities, of which none were more considerable than those of *Corinth* and *Ephesus*. The edict was enacted it is thought (See Lardner VI. 282.) on January 24th. A. D. 51. and Claudius died Oct. 13th. A. D. 54. The news of his death might reach Greece, and many might return to Rome, early in the year 55. Many might stay several years, and return to Rome in the year 57. Now Paul preached in Corinth during part of the year 51, the whole of 52, and part of 53. After going to Jerusalem he returned to Ephesus at the latter end of the year 53, and continued there the whole of the years 54 and 55, and to the Pentecost of 56. The return to Rome of persons who had been forced to leave it suddenly is so probable that it needs no proof. And that Paul should in the course of this time convert as many of these fugitives as are mentioned in Rom. xvi. is likewise very probable; nothing more so. It is likewise altogether probable that as no Apostle had ever preached the gospel at Rome before Paul came there, and the gifts of the Christian converts were not very considerable, (Rom. i. 2.) they might not be very conspicuous in their Christian profession, that is, they might not attract much attention from their unbelieving brethren; and that the compliment which Paul pays to their faith (Rom. i. 8.) referred only to the frequent good reports which Christians travelling from Rome into Greece gave of their steadfastness, which was the more meritorious, and drew this praise from the urbanity of the apostle, because it was maintained without any of the encouragement which the presence and gifts of an apostle would afford. The suppositions which I have made require that the church at Rome at this time should be chiefly composed of Jews; and the structure of the epistle favours this idea; because it is throughout a skilful apology to believing Jews for the admission of Gentiles to the privileges of the gospel. Having now prepared the way I come to consider the passage in Acts xxviii. 11—29. Mr. Evanson asserts positively that those who met Paul at Appii Forum were not Christians. But let any one examine the passage and it must incontestably appear that they were. For if the unbelieving Jews knew nothing of the matter, and must be called together by Paul on his coming to Rome, they could not know when to meet him at Appii Forum; nor would they have given themselves that trouble if they had known; but particularly, they could not have comforted Paul, or inspired him with courage, see 15th verse; but rather would have increased his affliction by their unbelief. It was after three days, spent doubtless in pleasing intercourse with 'those brethren' who had already shewn him so kind an attention, that he called the "*chief of the Jews* together." Not Aquila and Priscilla, the tent makers, with their household, nor any of those pious but probably humble persons, who had been his converts at Corinth and Ephesus; but the *chief men*, the doctors, and rulers of synagogues, the men of rank and authority. Paul does not address them as ignorant of the claims of Jesus, nor does their answer imply such ignorance; with great candour they declare that they have heard nothing to his disadvantage, and desire to hear the doctrine of the gospel fully explained, for that they know little more than that every where it is spoken against. Upon their separating themselves from him, however, he tells them that he will not hesitate to preach to the Gentiles of Rome, who were, not many of them, converted, before this period, to Christianity.

I have been the more particular upon this subject, because if I have clearly proved the perfect consistency of the history with the epistle, we have not only the natural strength of that evidence of the genuineness of the epistle, but also a striking testimony to the truth of both, from the air of independence and originality which appears in each of them; so that having very different forms, they are still united together by the eternal bond of truth.

T. H.

REVIEW.

Still pleas'd to praise, yet not afraid to blame.—Pope.

Sermons on Important Subjects, by Owen Manning, B. D. Late Prebendary of Lincoln, &c. in two Vols. octavo. pp. 375 and 294. Rivingtons. 1812.

The author of these sermons was born at Mears Ashby, in Northamptonshire. He was educated at Queen's College, Cambridge, where he took his several degrees of B. A. in 1740: M. A. in 1744: S. T. B. in 1753. While at Cambridge, he had the small pox, and was supposed to have died of that fatal disease. His body was actually laid out for interment, when his father looking stedfastly on the countenance thought he perceived signs of life. Proper means for recovery were used with success; the young man was restored to his family and friends, and became an ornament and benefactor to society. In 1763, he was presented, by Dr. Green, dean of Salisbury, to the vicarage of Godalming, in Surrey, and in 1769, to the rectory of Peper Hara, by the dowager Lady Middleton, and her son the viscount. To the literature of his own country Mr. Manning performed a most acceptable task, by completing the Saxon Dictionary begun by his friend Mr. Lye. This dictionary, the labour of 30 years, was published under the patronage of a handsome subscription, in 2 vols. folio, in 1772. To this Mr. Manning prefixed an account of the rise and progress of the work, in an elegant Latin preface, accompanying it also with a grammar of the Saxon and Gothic languages. In an appendix are subjoined fragments of Ulphilas's version of the epistle to the Romans, sundry Saxon charters, a Sermon on Antichrist, a Fragment of the Saxon Chronicle, and other instruments. Mr. Manning was author of the "History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey," and of several sermons which, with others, have been lately published in two volumes; and of these we are now to give a brief account.

These sermons, we are told, were left, by the author, for publication, "in the hope of counteracting certain doctrines which appeared to be gaining ground in these kingdoms." They are twenty-four in number, and on various important subjects, such as The Advantages of, and Rules for, Reading the Scriptures :—Salvation to Good Men under every Dispensation:—On Regeneration: —Election ;—Justification ;—Religious Melancholy ;—The Jewish and Christian Sabbaths ;—Coming to Christ ;—The Mercy and Works of God, &c.

From this enumeration, which does not embrace half the topics treated of in the volumes before us, the reader will easily perceive that they are amply sufficient to give full scope to the preacher's talents and zeal in displaying the true christian doctrines. He had, it appears, ever been anxious to lead the people entrusted to his care to a rational knowledge of the perfections of their Maker, as they are set forth in the Old and New Testament: that they might look to, and worship him as the God and Father of all men ; as being no respecter of persons, but the rewarder of all who sincerely endeavour to obey his commands. He considered what have been called (falsely called) the peculiar doctrines of the Christian religion as tending to vilify the attributes of his Maker, as pregnant with the most pernicious consequences when taught to the great mass of the people, and as tenets that cannot be fairly inferred from the writings of the prophets and apostles, in which the Deity is represented as having a free, spontaneous, and unpurchased paternal love for all his children. That Mr. Manning regarded the doctrines of regeneration, of election, justification, &c. as they are popularly taught, as corruptions of christianity, against which it is the duty of the Christian preacher to lift up his voice, is evident from the discourses which he has devoted to the discussion of these momentous subjects, and from which we could extract much interesting and important matter, would the limits of our publication allow us to enlarge.

Thus in the sermon on "Regeneration," he says, "to be converted, in its literal interpretation, signifies to be *turned about*, and is therefore in a religious sense the same thing with *repenting;* hence, when our Saviour urges upon his hearers that they are to be converted and become as little children, he implies that they should turn about from the way in which they are, to that in which they first set out—the way in which their gracious Maker placed them when he first set them forward on the perilous journey of life." On this subject the author argues with great force, that "whatever it be that is derived to us from the original transgression of Adam, *it cannot be guilt*: and that we are born with powers sufficient to enable us to grow up in goodness:" from these and other propositions which he justifies with much acuteness and sound argumentation, he deduces a number of very important inferences. A part of the concluding application we shall transcribe, as containing affectionate advice to that class of persons who are most likely to lend an ear to the voice of instruction.

> "To those then that are young, that are not yet advanced beyond that period of life when little or nothing can have been done in prejudice of their hopes, let me give this plain and short, but comprehensive admonition, to 'remember their Creator in the days of their youth,' so as to 'walk in his ways,' by 'ruling themselves after his word.' To remember him, while they may look up to him with joy, and before those 'evil days come,' when they will otherwise be driven to seek him and his pardoning mercy in the bitterness of sorrow. Their consciences reproach them hitherto with nothing that is matter of particular repentance. Let them take care then so to order their future goings, that when death at last shall overtake them, they may then also be found in the number of those 'just persons that need no repentance.'"

To persons who, from whatever cause, are apt to despond of the goodness of God, we earnestly recommend the Sermon on "Religious Melancholy," in which though the preacher does not attempt to enumerate every case of distress which apprehensions for their future condition give rise to, yet he states some of the principal of them, in order to convince his readers that if it is their sincere intention to serve and please God, though for the present they go on their way weeping, they shall however, come again with joy, and bring their sheaves with them.

The design of the Discourses on the Jewish and Christian Sabbaths, is to inquire into the origin of the nature of the former, and of the observance of the latter which took place on the establishment of Christianity; and of the obligations mankind have been under from time to time to pay a regular attention to them as institutions of divine original. Mr. Manning traces the origin of the Jewish sabbath not to the creation, but to the entrance of the children of Israel into the wilderness, at the time of their deliverance out of Egypt, more than 2500 years after the creation: hence he infers that the ritual law, and the sabbath as a *day of entire rest*, were given at the same time: the latter as a *sign* or mark of distinction between the Jews and the idolatrous nations with which they were surrounded. It was not of the nature of a moral duty; but a positive institution enjoined on the people of Israel *only;* and he adds:

> "With the exceptions to works of necessity and humanity, and such as related to the service of God in the temple, the Jewish sabbath required of that people a total cessation from all labours and occupations whatsoever: and, in this alone, as far as appears from the letter of the commandment, did the due observance of

it consist. For, as to what is said of God's having blessed, sanctified, hallowed, or ordered them to keep holy the sabbath day, it does not appear that any thing of a religious nature was implied in this; since the words themselves import nothing more than setting apart any thing, whatever it be, from ordinary uses; and no other purposes for which this day was set apart is so much as intimated in the law, but that alone of cessation from their usual labours. 'In it thou shalt do no manner of work,' was the whole of the commandment."

Mr. Manning thinks that the sabbath became a day devoted to religious services, not from any divine command, but that persons ordered to separate one day in seven from the common business of life, would naturally be led to that kind of reflection and meditation on the Creator, his works and providence, which would induce religious habits and at length religious worship, consisting of praise and thanksgiving for benefits already received, and of prayer and supplication for future blessings.

"Under the impression of these," says our author, "it would naturally occur to them, (the leaders of the people) as a measure of general use and importance to diffuse, among the people at large, their own sense of these matters; and this probably was what first suggested, as the most obvious method of doing it, the reading and interpreting of their law in their public assemblies. All this, I say, seems very natural, but we have no authority for saying how far it was the case in fact; for the scriptures which make no mention of any precept to this purpose, are totally silent also as to any practice of this sort in the earlier period of the Jewish dispensation."

Our readers will hence observe that Mr. Manning's theory is, that the sabbath as a day of rest, as a sign to distinguish the Jews from other people, was of divine appointment; but that the setting it apart for religious services was a matter of human expediency. He contends also that Christians, not being at all bound by Jewish ceremonies are not enjoined to separate one day in seven as a day of rest, and that the consecrating the first day of the week to religious services, depends not on express command, but that it had its origin, and has been continued from the consideration of the utility of such an institution. He traces the practice to the time of the apostles, and thinks their example, in this respect, equivalent to any precept they could have handed down to us on the subject.

We shall notice only one other of the Discourses before us, viz. that *On the Works of God*, and of their tendency to produce general happiness. From this we shall transcribe a paragraph which will shew the author's mode of reasoning on this important subject.

"When we pronounce of the works of God, in general terms, that they are good, it is always to be understood as spoken with a view to the whole of his design. With respect to any particular persons indeed, exclusively of the rest of mankind,—or, to our present situation and interest, independently of a future state,—or, to the immediate effects of second causes, without regard to their remoter consequences,—in this view of our condition, many of the events of life may certainly be considered as real evils; which yet, in a more extensive view of their influences upon the general state of mankind, or upon our own particular and separate interests, in some distant period of time, may be the greatest and most inestimable blessings. What we affirm therefore, with respect to the appointments of Providence, is, not that every particular dispensation, considered in itself, is a blessing, but that there is such a direct tendency of every particular event to the welfare and happiness of the whole; and to the welfare and happiness of every individual, upon the whole, as will justify us in pronouncing of the œconomy of things in general, of the government and administration of Providence, considered in all its parts, that it is, in all respects, and in every sense whatsoever, worthy of its author, —worthy of that goodness which suggested that wisdom which contrived, and that power which brought it into being. 'Behold, it is very good.'"

The practical considerations suggested by the author as deducible from the doctrines inforced in this Discourse, are (1), That whatever be our lot we can have no reason to complain: (2), That all the censures we pass, and all the exceptions we take to the works and government of God, in general, are groundless and unjust: and, (3), That we ought to entertain an honourable and just opinion of them, and to manifest the same to others, by a suitable treatment of them in our conversation and practice. This leads to the consideration of the influence which a persuasion of the goodness of God in all his works will have on our present condition. "Our happiness," says the author, "in any situation, has a principal dependence upon the opinion we have accustomed ourselves to form of it; and so sensible indeed of this is every wise and considerate person, that let his situation be what it will, he is ever careful to make the best he can of it,—to give every argument on the favourable side its full weight, —to make all possible allowance for such circumstances as are unfavourable in it; without being nice and curious to discover more of these than necessarily and unavoidably force themselves into the account:" the consequence of this is that he never repines at any thing that befals him: and that he acquiesces in the undoubted goodness of God as the foundation of his future hopes.

"Where there is a constant impression of this great truth," says our author, "habitually influencing our conduct, that 'every thing which God hath made is good,' the mind has a stay, which nothing can remove; a dependence which nothing can shake; a resource of confidence which nothing can exhaust or interrupt. His very being is a matter of joy and gratitude, as an earnest of an happy immortality: nor repines he at any conditions on which it may be appointed him to possess it for a season; as well knowing that, however grievous, they are but temporary, and will certainly obtain for him, in the end, 'a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.' In a word, knowing who it is that is his present 'shield,' and will infallibly prove hereafter his 'exceeding great reward,' the constant language of his tongue and heart is, 'Alleluiah! for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth.'"

From the foregoing account of these volumes we need scarcely add any thing by way of recommendation. Their intrinsic merit must be evident to our readers: they are instructive and animated, calculated to inform the mind, and inspire the heart with the best sentiments of God and religion. In general the reasoning is close and solid, and the inferences deduced from it natural and impressive.

The author who died at the age of 88, in September 1801, was a living exemplar of the doctrines and precepts which he so ably inculcated upon others: he was not more distinguished for erudition, than for the mildness of his manners and for his exemplary piety: his life, therefore, was to his parishioners as instructive as his discourses. As he did not scruple in those discourses publicly to avow sentiments not always in unison with the articles of the church to which he belonged, he wished all might enjoy the same liberty which he claimed for himself, and was, in the year 1772, one of the clergy who petitioned "for relief in the matter of subscription to the Liturgy and Thirty-nine Articles."*

ART. II. *A Plea for the Catholic Claims*: A Sermon, preached at the Chapel in Essex Street, March 10, 1813, being the Day appointed for a General Fast. By Thomas Belsham. 8vo. pp. 44. Johnson and Co. 1813.

Catholic Emancipation, daily gaining friends by becoming better understood, though daily opposed by the unenlightened or interested, who are already a minority and will soon cease to be a party, affords an example of the progress of truth and liberty in general: discussion is all they ask; fearless of opposition, provided it be open; secure of success, if inquiry be but excited.

Mr. Belsham opens his Sermon with an animated and cheering descant on the late rapid and universal growth of religious liberty, followed by reflections on the satisfaction of being conscious of participating and aiding the general improvement, and on the certainty of a glorious issue to all the plans of "Omnipotent benignity." The following simile is worthy of the subject, and more cannot be said of it:

> "The progress of improvement, intellectual and moral, individual and national, is like the flowing tide. A wave advances beyond the rest, and it falls back again; you would suppose that the sea was retreating; but the next wave pushes further still, and the succeeding one goes beyond that: so that, by a gradual, and, for some time, imperceptible, but sure and irresistible progress, the mighty element bears down every obstruction, and, in due time, occupies its destined station. Even before the inadvertent spectator is aware, the soil and slime, and all unsighily and rugged objects disappear, and the whole space is occupied by the beautiful and majestic main." pp. 6, 7.

What are the "Catholic Claims?"

> "What the Catholics implore is, that they may not lie under a public proscription; that they may not without a crime either proved or a ledged, be degraded from the rank of citizens of a free country; that they may be permitted, when their sovereign approves, and when their country invites, but not otherwise, to devote their lives, their fortunes, their talents, and their influence, to the service of their country, to the defence of its constitution, its rights, its laws and liberties, and to the advancement of its prosperity, whether in the senate, at the bar, on the bench, or in the field. Is this an unreasonable request?" p. 16.

It is well known that promises have been held out to the Catholics, and particularly that large promises were made to them on the eve of the Union, which have never been fulfilled; in a *note* (pp. 17, 18), Mr. Belsham refers to this subject, and relates an anecdote which acquits the King of being a party to any deception that may have been practised upon the Catholics.

> "Whatever promises were made or understood to be made by those who negociated the important measure of the Union, and how mortifying soever the disappointment of the Catholics, it is a pleasure to reflect that the character

---

* A copy of the Petition here referred to may be seen in the 7th vol. of Mr. Archdeacon Blackburne's Works.

of the sovereign was in no respect implicated. NO ROYAL PROMISE WAS VIOLATED. Of this the following anecdote, if authentic as it is said to be, contains ample proof. During the negociation, Mr Secretary Dundas, afterwards Lord Melville, submitted to his majesty a draught of the proposed articles of union to learn the royal pleasure, and to take his majesty's commands upon the subject. The monarch upon this occasion is reported to have said, 'I hope, Mr. Dundas, I am not pledged to extend the privileges of the Catholics.' 'Your majesty' replied the right honourable secretary, 'is pledged to nothing, but your majesty's ministers flatter themselves that the clauses relating to the Catholics will be interpreted liberally.' 'But, Mr. Dundas, you recollect the coronation oath.' 'I do recollect it, Sire,' replies the secretary, 'but your majesty will have the goodness to consider, that there is nothing in that oath which can bind your majesty from concurring in any measure which the wisdom of parliament may recommend.' 'None of your Scotch metaphysics for me, Mr. Dundas,' interrupted the monarch, with some warmth; 'I do not approve of your Scotch metaphysics:' and immediately broke up the conference. Who would not wish that a mind so honourable had been more enlightened, even though it should have been through the medium of Mr. Dundas's Scotch metaphysics?"

In reference to the stale charge of the Catholics having broken faith with heretics, Mr. Belsham protests against the imputation to children of the iniquities of fathers, and thus happily retorts upon and expostulates with the accuser.

"What for example, was the conduct of Charles the Second to the Presbyterians, who restored him with unrestricted prerogatives to the throne of his ancestors? What was the return made by the nation to the zealous nonconformists who, with confiding simplicity, supported a Bill by which they were themselves excluded from offices and honours, in order to keep out the Catholics, under a promise, expressed or understood that they should speedily be restored to their political rights? And where was the gratitude of the established church, after it had by the aid of the nonconformists, which it had implored in the hour of danger, compelled a Catholic tyrant to abdicate the throne? But shall we then say that it is a doctrine of the church of England, that faith is not to be kept with nonconformists? God forbid. Let every one bear his own burden. Let every one suffer the disgrace of his violated honour. But let not the innocent be confounded with the guilty; nor the honourable members of either the Catholic or the Protestant churches, bear the opprobrium of proceedings which they peremptorily disavow, and which they would neither imitate nor approve." pp. 21, 22.

We cannot go over all the topics of this well-timed, interesting Sermon, but there is a passage in the conclusion which forces itself upon us by the weight of its matter and the beauty of its style:

"Finally, it is alledged that all nonconformists, Catholic and Protestant, must be from principle, and in their hearts, *hostile* to the established religion, and from interest desirous to pull it down, and to build up their own communion upon its ruins. The prosperity therefore, and even the safety of the established church, requires that they should be deprived of political power.

"This is a very plausible and most imposing argument, and with many it has more weight than all the rest. But I hesitate not to assert, that it is an argument which will not bear examination, that it is a gross and dangerous paralogism, and that to act upon it is really to bring the established religion into that very crisis which it is so desirable to avoid. The settlement of ample revenues and the investment of the ministers of an establishment with high rank and dignity, is amply sufficient for the support of a national religion. And the church of England, protected by the laws, the customs, the opulence, and the fashion of the country, needs not, for her own security, to grasp at the monopoly of political power. She may be well content to share it in due proportion with the rest of the community.

"This, she may be assured, is the decided judgment of all who are not within the pale of her communion: and who see no reason, why they should be laid under the bar of a political proscription. And it may behove Churchmen to recollect, that these are in number more than half the population of the United Empire.

"The safety of the established communion depends, in a considerable degree, upon the division of the nonconformist interest. No sect, single-handed, is equal to cope with the national church, though all united might, if that were their object, accomplish her downfal.

"But so discordant are they in principle, and so hostile to each other in doctrine and in spirit, that nothing can possibly unite them, nothing can induce them to act in concert, but some great, common and oppressive grievance. Such is the universal denial of their proper share of political influence; laying the whole body indiscriminately under one general sentence of degradation and disgrace.

"Remove this single impediment, efface this general stigma, grant the nonconformists their birthright, as the natives of a free country, their eligibility to political office and power, and the bond of union is burst asunder. A mutual repulsion immediately takes place. And the mass, which, in a state of compression and confinement, threatened an explosion, which might endanger the constitution both of church and state, when thus set at liberty, evaporates into air, and becomes perfectly impotent and harmless." pp. 29—31.

Our extracts from the Sermon will have given it its proper character in the eye of the reader. Better commendation than our's it has procured the author, as we learn from common report, in a formal vote of thanks from the Committee (so eminent for rank and talents,) of the English Catholics.

Art. III. *Catholic Question.* A Letter, addressed to the inhabitants of Bristol, on the subject of the Petition against the Catholic Claims; comprising a Short View of the Catholic Question. With an Appendix, containing some Strictures on Mr. Thorp's "Intended Speech." By A Protestant Dissenter. 8vo. pp. 84. Bristol, Mills. London, Johnson and Co. 2s. 6d. 1813.

The "Protestant Dissenter," as we learn from the Preface, is Dr. Stock, the biographer of Dr. Beddoes. We thank him for not withholding his name: without diminishing his literary reputation, he has, by this means, done a service to the cause which he pleads, —as none can suspect him of being an incompetent, interested or insidious advocate of the Roman Catholics.

Our pages have already recorded the No Popery proceedings at Bristol [137—143]: to these we now refer only to remark, that we think great praise is due to Dr. Stock for entering coolly into a question which had been brought forward and determined under so much delusion and with so much clamour. The Letter contains a thorough examination of the Catholic claims, and few readers of it, we should think, can forbear coming to the Doctor's conclusion, that in justice and charity and policy, those claims ought to be fully granted. The Dr. evinces his own confidence in the goodness of his cause, by his candour towards the opponents of the Catholics, at Bristol, whose conduct had not entitled them to very gentle treatment.

One of those opponents was Mr. Thorp, a Dissenting minister! who seems to have raved against Catholic emancipation, out of a sheer love of religious liberty. The following is part of the reverend gentleman's "Intended Speech," in the form of an apostrophe to Popery:—"An ideal monster, that is sour, livid, full of scars, wallowing in gore, disgusted with every object around, and most of all disgusted with itself, is harmless and inoffensive in comparison with thee."—This insane writing would, in the general opinion, have justified severe chastisement; but Dr. Stock understands the malady of such authors as Mr. Thorp, and has contented himself with lenient correctives, which are most successful in altering a diseased constitution of mind.

ART. IV. *A Protestant Layman's Letter*, in Reply to the Rev. Mr. Thorp's Speech against Catholic Emancipation. 8vo. pp. 20. Hamilton, Paternoster Row. 1813.

This is another of the publications that have grown out of the discussion of the Catholic question at Bristol, and one of the few local publications that (like the last under review,) will bear, and repay, reading every where. The *Layman* has said enough, we think, to convince even Mr. Thorp, that the *Protestant*, ought not to hinder the civil rights of the *Catholic, Dissenter;* at any rate, his cool arguments and good temper must make the Reverend opposers of justice, charity and freedom at Bristol and other places, ashamed of their ignorance, violence and calumny.

The probable fate of the Protestant Dissenters' claims ought not to influence those of the Roman Catholics; we say, as Dissenters, let all others be *righted*, though we continue *wronged*. But it is a question of some interest, whether Catholic emancipation will free Protestant Dissenters from their bonds (see Layman's Letter, p. 20); we are not so "confident" on this head as the Layman; and should this article reach his eye, we would invite him to discuss this topic in that part of our work, devoted to Miscellaneous Communications.

ART. V. *A Sermon on the Influence of Religious Knowledge. as tending to produce a gradual Improvement in the Social State.* Preached at the Meeting-House, Monkwell Street, January 3, 1813. By James Lindsay, D. D. For the benefit of the Royal Lancasterian Institution. 8vo. pp. 56. Johnson and Co.

A sound head and a warm heart have both poured their contributions into this sermon, which is a glowing picture of knowledge and its attendant blessings. The case of *Athens* is happily brought forward and ably argued and made to bear upon the subject of the sermon (pp. 10—17); as is the character of the Quakers (pp. 33—38), whom Dr. Lindsay panegyrises, we are persuaded, sincerely, but, we suspect, rather exorbitantly;—we acknowledge the virtues of the Friends, but we cannot be blind to some capital defects, the necessary consequence of their moral system, among which is the insincerity, not always known to the subject of it, which is brought on by high-strained, impracticable pretensions.

The following passage contains, in the first sentence, a just view of late events, and in the second, a prediction, the fulfilment of which is due to truth, justice and freedom.

"Amidst all that we have to deplore in the melancholy events of the last 20 years, the heart of a Christian is consoled by the reflection, that the ascendency of Rome and the feodalties of a large portion of Europe, of which the one supported spiritual and the other civil despotism, are gone for ever. *The Church of France can never regain her power, because she can never regain her revenues; and the necessities of other countries will soon induce them also, to seize upon those riches, without which, in the present day, ecclesiastical authority would be perfectly impotent.*" (pp. 24, 25)

Art. VI. *Proof from Scripture that God, even the Father, is the only True God, and the only proper Object of Religious Worship:* containing Remarks on the Rev. Dr. J. Pye Smith's Discourse on the Adoration of our Lord Jesus Christ. By Lant Carpenter, LL. D. 12mo. 1s. 6d. Johnson and Co. 1812.

To those who are acquainted with Dr. Carpenter's former publications, in favour of Unitarianism, the title of this pamphlet will be a sufficient recommendation of it. Dr. Carpenter enters thoroughly into his subject, and meets objections in all their force and disposes of them with ability. To opponents he is exemplarily candid, and his strain of writing, tinctured with unaffected piety, is peculiarly fitted to conciliate such readers as apprehend that Unitarians are strangers to religious feeling.

The remarks on Dr. Smith's Discourse are, we humbly think, a complete vindication of the sole worship of the One God, the Father. We should be really glad to see Dr. Smith's plain and direct answer to them.

Art. VII. *The Grounds of Unitarian Dissent.* A Sermon, preached Nov. 15, 1812, at the opening of the Chapel in Union Place, Glasgow. By James Yates, M. A. 12mo. 3d Edition, (1st and 2d Editions 8vo.) pp. 36. Glasgow: Brash and Reid. London: Longman and Co. 1813.

The opening of a chapel for the sole worship of the One God, in Glasgow, forms an era in the history of Unitarianism. The station is most important, and the duties of the minister who fills it are in no common degree arduous; the Unitarian church at Glasgow is happy, however, in the enjoyment of the services of such a preacher as our author, who writes well, reasons forcibly, and manifests a serious conviction of the importance, and a becoming zeal for the diffusion, of divine truth.

Mr. Yates lays down the three following "Grounds of Unitarian Dissent," "1, The free and unbiassed Use of the Understanding on Religious Subjects; 2, The Worship of God the Father only; 3, Holiness of Heart and Excellence of Conduct the only means of obtaining Salvation." These principles are clearly explained and zealously enforced.

We wish permanence to the connection between Mr. Yates and his people, so honourable to him and so useful to them; and we hope that through their joint labours, and those of other Unitarians, and Unitarian Societies, we shall have the pleasing duty of recording the dedication of many houses of prayer in Scotland to the God and Father of Jesus Christ.

Art. VIII. *The Full Reward of the Faithful Minister of the Gospel in the growing Improvement of his Hearers.* A Sermon preached at the Quarterly Meeting of an Association of Protestant Dissenting Ministers, at Stand, near Manchester, September 10, 1812, and published at their request. By William Turner. 8vo. pp. 24. Newcastle, Hodgson. London, Johnson and Co. 1812.

Seriousness, fervour, and affectionateness characterize this Sermon, which forms an admirable text on which Christian ministers may preach to their own hearts, and a judicious rule by which hearers of the gospel, who are in earnest in religion, may judge of their improvement under the means of grace.

Art. IX. *The Principles of Protestant Dissenters stated and vindicated;* in a Sermon preached at the Old Jewry Chapel, on March 10th, the day appointed for a General Fast, and published at the Request of many who heard it. By Abraham Rees, D. D. F. R. S. F. L. S. Editor of the New Cyclopædia. 8vo. pp. 48. Longman and Co. 1813.

Were Fast Days always employed by dissenting ministers in the delivery of such sermons as this, there is no consistent dissenter who would not welcome their arrival. Amidst his arduous labours for the public good, Dr. Rees has found leisure for the publication of a brief but satisfactory exposition of the principles, the grievances and the claims of the dissenters. We thank him for this new service to the cause of truth and liberty; and we cheerfully refer to his sermon such of our readers as wish to be informed on the dissenting question, which must we conceive soon undergo legislative discussion, or to learn the views and expectations of the leaders amongst the dissenters in this day-dawn of complete religious freedom. In our judgment Dr. Rees speaks in this discourse the sentiments of all respectable dissenters of the three denominations, and we trust he will be heard by the public with a degree of attention proportioned to the importance of the subject and to the weight of his talents and character.

INTELLIGENCE.

Unitarian Fund.

The annual meeting of this Society was held agreeably to advertisement (in this work and in the public papers), on Wednesday the 9th instant, in the Unitarian Chapel, in Parliament Court.

The religious service was opened by singing, the *Rev. W. Vidler*, minister of the chapel, reading the hymns. Next, the Rev. *Thomas Rees* delivered the introductory prayer, and read the twenty-fourth chapter of Acts. The Rev. *S. S. Toms*, of Framlingham, engaged in the second prayer, which by its simplicity, fervour, and true Christian strain much affected the worshippers. The preacher was the Rev. *Edmund*

Butcher, of Sidmouth; the subject—*Heresy;* the text—Acts xxiv. 14, *But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my Fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets;* upon which Mr. Butcher made three observations, which were the heads of his discourse, viz. 1, That Paul was neither ashamed nor afraid to own himself a heretic; 2, That notwithstanding his heresy, he conceived that he retained the piety of his ancestors; 3, That both his heresy and his piety were the consequence of his being a sound and pious believer. These observations naturally spread out into a statement of the duty of free inquiry, and of the principles which are now chiefly deemed heretical, i. e. the doctrines of Unitarianism. In conclusion, the preacher pleaded warmly, and we are happy to add successfully, on behalf of the Unitarian Fund. Many of his reflections appeared peculiarly pertinent, in consideration of his own recent avowal of a change of opinions. He concluded the service by prayer.

The congregation was numerous, and the collection at the doors larger, we believe, than on any former occasion.

Many individuals concurred in requesting *Mr. Butcher* to publish his sermon; with which request we understood him to have complied.*

After divine service the members of the Society proceeded to business, *James Young*, Esq. in the chair; a considerable part of the congregation staying, by invitation from the Chairman, to hear the Reports.

The Treasurer reported the state of the Fund, according to the audit of the accounts, on the 1st of January, by which it appeared that the expenditure of the last year had exceeded the income by fifty pounds. It was added, however, that an improvement had taken place in the finances of the Society during the few months of the present year, in consequence of the adoption of measures, the benefits of which are only beginning to be felt; and a hope was expressed that the next report of the state of the Fund would be answerable to the highest expectations of the members. It was also understood that no falling off would have appeared in the Treasurer's balance, if the subscriptions in arrears had been paid in; these are chiefly the country subscriptions, which the Collector has no means of obtaining. We therefore take the liberty of suggesting to subscribers in the country the propriety of transmitting their subscriptions to the Treasurer or Secretary as early in the year as is convenient.

The Secretary next proceeded to read the Report of the Committee, which embraced a great variety of topics, and extended to a considerable length. It appears that the labours of the Society, increasing every year, are every year more important and successful. Although some interesting documents were not brought into the Report, in consequence of their having been communicated by the Committee to this work, it was still found necessary to exclude some matters of intelligence and to touch very briefly upon others. Even of Mr. Wright's Journals comparatively little use was made.—The first topic of the Report was Mr. Smith's Bill, now before parliament, for the relief of the Unitarians, which grew out of an interview of a deputation of the Committee with the Rev. T. Belsham, and a subsequent communication from these two parties to Mr. Smith.—Scotland was the next topic: here there are two considerable congregations, with acceptable and popular ministers, Glasgow and Edinburgh; the Unitarian cause is also in a prosperous state at Dundee, where Mr. R. Millar has so long officiated, and for this place a minister is wanted. From these and other places, the Committee have been importuned to engage the services of one of the missionaries in the North. The only mission actually resolved upon, however, was one now in a course of completion, by the Rev. Mr. Campbell, of Newcastle. This was planned by Mr. Turner, of Newcastle, who contributed to the Report a full account of the plans of Mr. Haldane, the patron of Dissent in Scotland, under whom Mr. Campbell was brought forward in the ministry.

---

* Any persons desirous of more than a single copy are invited to give their names, with the number of copies they wish for, to the Editor.

In the short abstract of Mr. Wright's labours, was a pleasing account of a recent missionary journey into Suffolk and Norfolk, in which counties, Norwich is, of course, the most prominent place; here Mr. Wright was welcomed into three pulpits: by the countenance and assistance of the Norwich ministers he gained admittance likewise into some of the neighbouring villages.—The congregation at Reading answers to the character given in the last report: they have engaged a commodious place of worship, and are anxiously looking out for a minister.—The latest measure taken by the Committee and brought into the report was the visit of Mr. Vidler to Chatham, where he still continues exciting much attention.—The Society were much gratified in learning that already they are aided by the Unitarian Academy, the students in which have begun to officiate at Stratford, and to supply for Mr. Vidler in his absence.—It was announced that the Committee had been so happy as to engage the services of the Rev. John Kentish, of Birmingham, as the preacher of next year;—application is made to the Rev. T. Madge, of Norwich, to preach the year following.

The Committee concluded with expressing their great satisfaction in having been able to obtain the consent of about one hundred gentlemen, chiefly ministers, in the country, to receive subscriptions for the Society; and their strong hope that under this patronage and with this assistance the means of the Society would be fully adequate to any object they might have in view. The hope will, we are persuaded, be re-echoed by our readers.

The Report, of which the above is a hasty abstract, was received by the Society, and directed to be published in substance. Thanks were voted to the Rev. E. Butcher, for his sermon; to the Rev. J. Kentish the preacher-elect, for his agreeing to the wishes of the Committee; to the Rev. W. Turner, for his communications and advice; to the ministers and others who have assisted the missionaries, during the past year; to the country receivers; to the missionaries; and to the several officers of the Society, &c. &c. It was resolved that the Society approved of the step taken by the Committee, in conjunction with the Rev. T. Belsham, with regard to the penal laws against Unitarians. The expediency of a mission to Scotland was the subject of another resolution. The following gentlemen were chosen into office for the year ensuing, viz.

Mr. John Christie, Mark Lane, Treasurer.
Rev. Robert Aspland, Hackney-Road, Secretary.

COMMITTEE.

Mr. Sam. Barton, Bishopsgate-Street,
— David Eaton, High Holborn,
— David Gibbs, Grub Street,
— William Hall, Crosby Square,
— Samuel Hart, Paternoster-Row, Spitalfields,
Rev. Thomas Rees, Bernard's Inn,
— William Vidler, West Ham.

AUDITORS.

Mr. L. Rowe, Brentford,
Mr. W. Sturch, Stanhope Street.

After the business was concluded, the members and their friends adjourned to the London Tavern to dinner, where a still larger company was assembled than ever before met on this occasion: namely, upwards of Three Hundred persons, — William Frend, Esq. in the chair.

[The further account of this day, so auspicious to the Unitarian Fund, is reluctantly but unavoidably deferred to our next. Ed.]

Unitarian Academy.

The Annual Meeting of Subscribers to this Institution was held at the King's Head in the Poultry, on Thursday the 10th instant.

The Committee's Report read to this meeting consisted, besides the Treasurer's accounts, chiefly of a communication from the Theological Tutor, respecting the good character of the students, for application and deportment, and the fair expectations which may be indulged as to their progressive improvement. The short period elapsed since the commencement of the Academy, and that necessarily occupied in mere elementary instruction, rendered impracticable, for this year, the proposed annual examination.

The report having been approved, it was resolved unanimously, on the recommendation of the Committee that the services of the Students under the direction of the Theological Tutor be offered to the Unitarian Fund.

At the suggestion of Dr. Cogan, the following Resolution was passed unanimously,

That the Rev. Mr. Aspland be desired to express to the students under his tuition, the great satisfaction of this society, at the favourable report transmitted to them, of their diligence and exemplary behaviour, which is so honourable to themselves, and so encouraging, respecting the object of the institution.

It was further resolved unanimously,

That the kind offer of the Exeter Trustees, respecting the loan of their books, be accepted. A hope was expressed in the Committee's report "that this commencement of a library will encourage donations of books from other friends to the objects of the Institution."

That the Committee provide, as soon as possible, a classical tutor. This resolution could not fail to be connected with the recollection of the loss sustained by the Academy in the decease of Mr. Dewhurst. The theological tutor, referring to this event, in his communication to the Committee, well says, that "as long as the Institution lives, it will be recorded to its honour that the first scholar amongst the Protestant Dissenters had engaged his learning and character in its service."

Thanks were unanimously voted to the students of York Academy for their handsome donation of 10*l*. to this Institution. This resolution to be transmitted to the Rev. Mr. Wellbeloved.

The thanks of the Meeting were also unanimously expressed to the Rev. Russell Scott, of Portsmouth, for the liberal donation presented by him from his congregation to aid the funds of this Institution.

The following officers were elected for the year ensuing.

Mr. John Christie, Treasurer.

Committee—Dr. Cogan, Messrs. W. Frend, T. Gibson, T. Hardy, E. L. Macmurdo, J. T. Rutt, J. Young; Secretary, Mr. Richard Taylor; Auditors, Messrs. S. Parkes and R. Stevens.

Any of whom will receive subscriptions or donations from those who wish to encourage the objects of the Unitarian Academy. R.

General Baptists' Assembly.

On Whitsun Tuesday was held at Worship Street the GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE GENERAL BAPTISTS, when many friends were present from various parts of the country. The Rev. JOSEPH DOBELL preached an excellent sermon on the occasion from Eph. i. 22. "And gave him to be the head over all things to the church." At four o'clock, when the business relative to hechurches was done, the company retired to dine at the White Hart Tavern, Bishopsgate Street, where they passed the remaining part of the day, the REV. J. EVANS in the Chair, with brotherly love and Christian harmony. E.

Dudley Double Lecture.

On Whit-Tuesday, June 8th, the Annual Meeting of Ministers, denominated "the Double Lecture," was holden at Dudley. The Rev. John Kentish conducted the devotional service. Two very interesting and impressive discourses were delivered:—the former, by the Rev. John Corrie, on the value of revelation, from Luke ii. 10, 11. "And the angel said unto them, Fear not; for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord:"—and the latter by the Rev. Dr. Toulmin, on the reciprocal duties of a minister and the people of his charge, from 1 Cor. iv. 1. "Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God." The readers of the Monthly Repository will learn with pleasure that both the sermons are to be printed. Fifteen ministers were present, and the congregation was numerous. At the anniversary in 1812, it was unanimously resolved, that the senior preacher in future be requested to select some subject connected with the duties of ministers and people in dissenting congregations, and the younger preacher some subject connected with the evidences of divine revelation.

J. H. B.

Warwickshire Unitarian Tract Society.

The Annual Meeting of the Members of the UNITARIAN TRACT SOCIETY, established in Birmingham for WARWICKSHIRE and the neighbouring Counties, will be holden at Hinckley in Leicestershire, on Wednesday, July 7, 1813. The Rev. James Tayler, of Nottingham, has engaged to preach on the occasion. Religious service will begin at eleven o'clock.

Western Unitarian Society.

The General Annual Meeting of the WESTERN UNITARIAN SOCIETY will be holden at Taunton on Wednesday, the 14th of July next, when a sermon will be preached by the Rev. Joseph Hunter, of Bath, or, in case of failure, by the Rev. T. Howe, of Bridport.

Meeting of the Norfolk and Suffolk Unitarian Book Society.

The first Meeting of the NORFOLK and SUFFOLK UNITARIAN BOOK SOCIETY, called the EASTERN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION, will be held at Norwich, on Thursday, the 22nd of July: the Sermon to be preached by Mr. Aspland. There will be a Sermon on the preceding evening. One of the services will be at the Octagon, the other in Mr. Perry's Meeting House, Cherry Lane. On Tuesday the 20th, there will be public services in the General Baptist Meeting House, Norwich, on occasion of the ordination of Mr. Winder:---Mr. Wright, of Wisbeach, Mr. Philpot, of Saffron Walden, and Mr. Gilchrist, of London, to preach.

Lincolnshire and Cambridgeshire Unitarian Association.

The LINCOLNSHIRE and CAMBRIDGESHIRE UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION will be held at Boston, on Thursday, the 29th day of July: the Rev. R. Aspland, of Hackney, and the Rev. Thomas Madge, of Norwich, to preach on the occasion. Dinner at the White Hart Inn. There will be a Sermon preached on Wednesday evening the 28th.

J. P.

Kent and Sussex Unitarian Christian Association.

The second Meeting of the KENT and SUSSEX UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION, was held at Tenterden, on Wednesday, June 16, and was numerously and respectably attended. The Rev. J. W. Morris, of Lewes, conducted the introductory and devotional part of the service; and the Rev. J. Dobell delivered a very appropriate and comprehensive discourse from Ephes. i. latter part of 22nd verse. Eighty-four persons, or upwards, afterwards dined together. A small Tract Society for the dissemination of valuable knowledge, and the promotion of Christian piety and virtue, was determined on; and corresponding resolutions adopted. Mr. Dobell was requested by the associators to print his sermon, which he obligingly complied with; and it was adopted as a second number.

The day passed in perfect harmony. Several persons addressed the Meeting; and all present appeared to be animated with one spirit of zeal, in support of that great first principle of religion, the unity of the one only living and true God; accompanied with the liberality and charity which will ever possess the minds and distinguish the characters of all truly enlightened and sincere Christians.

L. HOLDEN.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR,

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

The Catholic question is of far greater importance than its proposers or opposers ever attributed to it. Party may have influenced it, and worldly politics had a great bias on the sentiments of all sides. But we look beyond the narrow schemes of the worldly politician; who is far from being what he deems himself to be, a very mighty and important agent in the affairs of the world. He is merely an instrument in the hands of a Superior, whose thoughts are not as our thoughts, nor his ways as our ways; who can bring good out of evil, and turn the vain designs of men to purposes which they never imagined, and to which, could they have foreseen the result of their efforts, they would never have given their assent.

The two chief Catholic sects in this island have opposed each other, as it is said, tooth and nail, and the established sect has gained a temporary superiority. Its spirit has thus been shewn; but we have now to record a generous act on the part of a third sect, which is established in the northern part of this island. The kirk of Scotland in its grand constituted assembly, consisting of elders and ministers, has petitioned Parliament in favour of the Catholics. This is a firm and decisive step. The opposition of the churchmen of England was carried on in what we might call an underhand way, by all the schemes of narrow politics; in Scotland the question was discussed in a solemn manner, and the result was highly honourable to its members. The Catholics may now boast that they have a very decided majority of the population of the United Kingdom in their favour; and we trust that this act of the kirk of Scotland will produce a beneficial effect on the minds of those dissenters in England, who, desirous of civil privileges for themselves, refuse to allow their neighbours' claim to an equal participation with them in what in fact is the common right of all mankind.

We must here impress on the minds of our readers, that the kirk of Scotland is as much established by law in the North, as the church of England is in the South of this island. The churchman with all his pride and self-consequence here becomes, the moment he passes the Tweed, a dissenter. His arrogance must give way to pretensions founded on just as good a claim for superiority as he advances here: and we, who look upon both as merely civil institutions, in which the church of Christ is no more concerned than with the respective arrangements of the army and navy, cannot but smile at these changes of superiority in the episcopalian and presbyterian. But the difference of the two churches in the treatment of the catholic question leads us to a more accurate investigation of their constitution, and to attribute a superiority to that of Scotland, which though it does not remove the charge of assimilation to the kingdoms of this world, yet holds out the hope that it may gradually be brought nearer to a resemblance of the church of Christ.

Very happily for the country the convocation is no longer permitted to sit; for if it did it would be merely an assembly of priests, than which it is impossible to conceive a worse for the general comfort and improvement of mankind. The church of England is ruled by certain laws, of which the bishops are the chief executive officers. In Scotland is a representative body, consisting of ministers and elders, or in vulgar terms, of clergy and laity, in which the affairs of the church are decided. The mixture of the laity, as they are called, a term by the way unknown to the Christian church, gives a manifest superiority to this establishment; for the experience of mankind has proved that churchmen by themselves, of whatever denomination they may be, are very unfit to be trusted with the government of any community.

This may be called strong language, but we appeal to the history of mankind for the proof of our assertion. Every institution indeed of man partakes of the weakness of the individual or individuals, by whom it is formed: and this is to be kept continually in mind, when we reason upon the constitution of any society. If a set of men meet together to legislate for another set, with whom there is not a strict community of interests, such is the frailty of human nature, that we cannot expect, that the interests of the ruled should be consulted when they come in competition with the interests of the rulers. Hence the great art in all human institutions is to make the rulers feel as much as possible for the ruled, and in nothing was the policy of the church of Rome more manifest, than when by preventing its priests from marrying, it formed a separate society of rulers, as much removed as human nature allowed, from the class subjected to its spiritual authority. The superiority of the church of England to that of Rome is greatly owing to the priests of the former being by marriage connected with the governed, but still they form a separate body, acting under determinate laws. The church of Scotland is superior to the church of England, in that their clergy are not only united by marriage to the party governed; but also the party governed has its delegates in the general assembly of the church, whose affairs are thus managed by the joint voices of what are called clergy and laity. The superiority of the church of Christ is manifest, in that it admits of no such distinction as that of clergy and laity, and in its regulations, for all its rules have been previously laid down by its great Author, every member of the community is consulted.

The catholic question has been managed chiefly by the laity in both islands, and this in England has been attended with a singular occurrence. In the English Committee was a Romish bishop, who threw out very severe insinuations against one of his colleagues, a man as justly celebrated for his talents and integrity as beloved for his urbanity of manners and general benevolence. This language suited rather the priestly character of the fourteenth than of the nineteenth century, and the committee shewed, that they stood no longer in dread of an episcopal mitre, for they voted the bishop out of their body. In fact the catholics of England are no more in blind subjection to the see of Rome, than the churchmen of England are to that of Canterbury. The age of priestly delusion is gone by, and the meeting together of the catholics for the discussion of their civil rights necessarily opens their mind to a variety of topics connected with religion. In Ireland however, the body of delegates does not seem to have acted with all the prudence, which the situation of their affairs demands. They have entered into a question, which might well have been avoided, and voted an address to the Princess of Wales on her escape from the attacks of her enemies. In this it does not seem to have had the concurrence of its chief members, for they were not at the meeting upon this occasion, and it can no longer be concealed, that they were not likely by this step to heal the breach, which so unaccountably subsists between them and the high character, in whom their hopes were at one time so fondly centred.

As delegates came over from Ireland to transact the business of the Irish catholics in this country, many of the friends of civil and religious liberty united to give them a dinner on their departure. A very large list of stewards appeared upon this occasion, consisting, with very few exceptions, of members of the two houses of the legislature. The chair was filled by the Duke of Bedford, who was supported by the Royal Dukes of Kent and Sussex. A display of oratory took place, such as might be expected, when the speakers were those, who are most distinguished for their talents in parliament, and one feeling prevailed over all, that of an enlarged and liberal way of thinking with respect to all men, whatever may be their religious denomination. A circumstance that must excite grief in every liberal mind, was alluded to by his royal highness the Duke of Sussex; namely, that the spirit of the Orange faction in Ireland had been caught by some unhappy men, in this country, who are forming Orange-lodges, and administering illegal oaths of secrecy, by way of perpetuating religious animosity amongst us We cannot think that Englishmen will degrade themselves to become instruments of so contemptible a party spirit.

The question of religion in India, has been frequently alluded to in the House of Commons, and on the resolution concerning it being introduced, very contrary opinions were maintained. On the one hand it was asserted, that the reports of the conversion of Hindoos, by missionaries, are fallacious in the highest degree; that of the very few who were or who pretended to be converted, every one was a rogue: that the religion of the Hindoos was pure and unexceptionable, the exposing of children and burning of women being no part of their religious code, and to be paralleled by the suicides and murders of infants by mothers, in this Christian country; that the dancing girls of India found a counterpart in the prostitutes of the highly civilized city of London;—that in a population of nine hundred thousand persons, in a district in India, there were only eighty-eight commitments for every species of crime, in ten years; and in the city of London alone were, in the last year, sixteen hundred and sixty-three commitments; — that the moral character of the Hindoos was a great deal better than the moral character of the people of this country, high and low; — and that we ought to entertain more anxiety to save the lives of thirty thousand of our fellow countrymen, than the souls of all the Hindoos, by the probable advantages of Christianity. These propositions were all met with counter assertions, and it was contended, that the communication of knowledge must be a good, and from this good the Hindoos ought not to be debarred; that no unfair means were to be used in promoting Christianity, but that the natives should, at least, have the opportunity of seeing it in its true colours;—that the best way of rooting out the foul enormities perpetrated in Bengal, was by introducing Christianity amongst the natives. We may observe, in general, that on both sides, the word Christianity is used without attaching any definite ideas to it; and, that the different parties refer to very different standards in speaking of it. By some it is estimated by the established religion of this country; by others, by the doctrines of various sects in it; by others, according to the lives of the professors of it; by a few according to the law of life, in the New Testament. In general, indeed, little is meant by the conversion of the Hindoos, but to exchange their worship of one sort of a Trinity for another,—to restrain their numerous incarnations to one only, supposed to have taken place in Palestine,—and to remove their bramins for a Christian priesthood. But much more is requisite, and we do not scruple to speak it plainly, namely, to take off the reproach of Christianity, by Christians living worthy of the religion they profess, by shewing themselves to be really the disciples of the Prince of Peace, by being able to convince the Hindoos, that they all belong to the family of love, that they all speak the same thing, worshipping in spiritual union, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and looking forward with firm confidence to the establishment of the kingdom of heaven. When this is done only in this small island, then may we send forth our missionaries to India, and then will the Hindoos no longer turn a deaf ear to those arguments, which are sufficiently refuted by the appeal to the manners, lives and diversities of opinions of the professors of Christianity.

The attention of the public has been diverted from religious to financial subjects, and a loan of twenty-seven millions for the present year naturally makes a deep impression. It is attended with this novel circumstance, that no new taxes are raised, and consequently the country feels little embarrassment from the measure. This arises from the views now taken of the sinking fund, a mysterious term, like that of the Trinity, on which, for a long time, it was scarcely deemed less than sacrilege to meditate. The necessity of the times has, however, dispelled the delusion, and people now begin to enquire with freedom, why they should borrow with one hand to pay with the other. We have now a large annual sum raised on the public, to redeem the national debt, that is to make purchases of stock, whose interest is regularly paid to commissioners, and applied in the same manner for purchasing more stock, the nation in the mean time, not receiving the least benefit from these purchases, the stock being merely transferred from one name to another, and looking to a remote period when the stock is to be entirely cancelled. Instead of going on with this pernicious plan, and raising new taxes for a new loan, the government has made a loan for the services of the present year, the interest of which is paid by the sum in the Commissioners' hands for the reduction of the national debt. This sum will be about a million and a half a year, and consequently for the next year their purchases will be less by that sum. Next year a similar loan may be made in the same manner, and till all the money in the commissioners' hands is thus appropriated, we may go on with the war, without a new tax. To enter into an examination of the demerits of the sinking fund, on the former plan, and how far the new system is capable of improvement, would take up too much of our time; but where is the mind that is not impressed with grief at at the appropriation of these twenty-seven millions, and with hopes that the time will come, when man, entertaining better views of his destination, will turn his loans, in every country, to the benefit, not to the destruction, of his species. Twenty-seven millions, expended in this island, would drain its marshes, excavate canals, form roads, and remove every nuisance and obstruction to air or water in populous cities. But the god of this world has blinded the hearts of men, that they should not see how their temporal and eternal interests would be consulted, by taking upon themselves the easy yoke of the Prince of Peace, and fitting themselves for the inheritance promised to all his true followers.

Dreadful murders have excited alarms in the bosom of every family. The horrors of a field of battle and the destruction of the villages where they were perpetrated, created a far less sensation than the murder of a worthy couple in their beds, by a ruffian, who put an end to their existence with savage ferocity and a profusion of blood. We would not diminish the feeling for our fellow creatures, thus prematurely taken out of the world: but let those who delight in war reflect, how many similar horrors are perpetrated, not on the field of battle merely, but in various places where a licentious soldiery have the mastery over the feeble inhabitants. In the comments of writers on the New Testament, and in the sermons of preachers, it is not uncommon to have an improvement, as they call it, on the text; and an improvement on these domestic murders might be made, by prayer to the Almighty, to turn our hearts, not only from the shedding of the blood of our fellow-creatures, but from every evil passion which tends to their injury.

A cessation from slaughter has taken place in one part of Europe. The Russians, Prussians and French have agreed to abstain for six weeks from the perpetration of those acts which have lately stained the fields of Germany with so much human blood. May the Supreme Arbiter of all events infuse into the breasts of the respective sovereigns an ardent desire to extend this to a more lasting period, and that all the nations concerned in the late animosities may, with a spirit of conciliation, search into the cause of their disputes, and arrange them as beings ought to do who are endued with reason! The armistice was not settled till after many a hard-fought field, in which both sides claim the victory: but the continual advance of the French proved, that whatever might be the language of their opponents, with themselves lay the real advantage. The political grounds of this armistice cannot be ascertained in this country. The sources of information are very scanty; the real state of the contending armies is very imperfectly known. It was a great thing for the French Emperor to have brought into the field an army potent enough to drive back his enemies, and instead of fighting for his dominions on the banks of the Rhine, to stand forth in the heart of Silesia, the avenger of his wounded honour. He cannot lose by the armistice, as, in the period assigned to it, he can recruit his armies, and particularly be able to make up his deficiency in cavalry. Russia will have more difficulty in this respect, and perhaps she begins to be tired with the war, and would gladly listen to terms of accommodation.

The part that Austria has to act is now of high importance, and this power is said to be the mediator of the intended peace. A congress, at one time, was to be established for this purpose; but a rumour has arrived, that the four sovereigns of France, Austria, Russia, and Prussia are to meet and to make their own arrangements, independent of subordinate officers. It cannot be doubted, in this case, that every thing will be conducted with greater ease; but little foresight is necessary to determine which will have the greatest advantage in the conference. In the mean time, the troops of the respective powers are stationed within certain lines of demarcation, and of course each party will prepare itself for renewing the conflict, in case hostilities should re-commence.

Sweden has really entered this conflict, or, at any rate, made a demonstration, the Crown Prince being with an army of Swedes in Germany. For this effort he is to be paid by Great Britain with a million of money, the cession of the island of Guadaloupe, and the support of Russia and England in his design of annexing Norway to Sweden. Thus, in this disastrous war, the throne of Denmark, one of the oldest allies of Great Britain, is likely to be the greatest sufferer. Its fleet seized in the port, its capital burnt, its West India islands lost, it is now threatened with the separation of its ancient territories. To justify all this, politicians say, that Denmark is allied to France, and therefore we may do to it what injury we please: and it is in vain for Denmark to urge, that she chose unwillingly her side, that all she did was by constraint. The law of the politician is decisive; the weak are doomed to suffer. On the other hand, the politicians are not quite agreed on the propriety of ceding an island during war, as it too much resembles the jacobin principle of revolutionary France, of determining, during war also, what conquests should be annexed to its territory; nor do they allow, on the same grounds, the partition of the realm of Denmark and Norway, in which, besides, they do not see any propriety, as any diversion in that quarter will have little or no effect on the great enemy, and will prevent the Swedes from exerting their efforts in a proper direction.

Hamburgh is again at the mercy of the French, and is suffering under pecuniary contributions; but no marks of that vengeance which were dreaded have as yet appeared. The expected insurrection in the north of Germany has been of little use. In France *Te Deums* have been sung, for repeated victories; and the constituted authorities have been accused, in our papers, for the blasphemous manner in which the praises of the congregations have been called for. If we had not seen similar abominations practised in every country in time of war, we should join seriously in the same censure: but where is the country that does not, in the same manner, call on him whom they style the God of battles? The Cardinal Maury has rendered himself conspicuous on this occasion, and the addresses of this churchman are a signal proof of the versatility of his talents.

Every thing leads to expectation in Spain. Lord Wellington has advanced to Salamanca, and the armies on both sides are marching and countermarching. The United States of America have had some advantages in Upper Canada, of which they have taken the capital; and their marine already begins to be talked of under the name of the navy. But we cannot finish our review without coming back to our own country, and declaring our satisfaction at the rebuke given by the Speaker of the House of Commons to a person brought to its bar for corrupt practices in the election of members of parliament. He is only, it seems, a very poor person; but be he what he may, the Speaker delivered the sentiments of the House on this occasion. He has declared his own and their sentiments on the wickedness of those men who sap the morality of the country, by corrupting its citizens in the duties they have to perform, and the eminent privileges they possess. How great then must be the wickedness of a House of Commons, should it connive at similar practices in any of its members!

ERRATA.

Vol. VIII. P. 226, 2d col. l. 25 from the top, for 1797 read 1787.
333, 1st col. l. 2 from the bottom, for *Bend* read *Band.*
336, 2d col. l. 6 from the bottom, after the word *iniquity* place *a comma* instead of *a period.*
337, 1st col. l. 15 from the bottom, after the word *aid*, place *a note of interrogation.*
Ib. 2d col. l. 24 from the top, for *dram* read *dream.*
340, 2d col. l. 15 from the bottom, for *latter* read *letter.*
363, Note, l. 17 from the bottom, for *consitatus* read *concitatius.*

THE
MONTHLY REPOSITORY
OF
Theology and General Literature.

No. XCI. JULY. [Vol. VIII.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

Brief Account of the Rev. W. Hopkins, by the Rev. F. Stone.

SIR,

I now proceed to communicate to you some particulars respecting the Rev. William Hopkins, rector of Bolney, and curate of Cuckfield, Sussex, author of "An Appeal to the Common Sense of all Christian People,"—in favour of the Arian Trinity, as opposed to the Athanasian hypothesis.—He also published a larger tract, on the same subject, of which the title does not occur to my memory.*—Having passed out of a state of celibacy into that of matrimony, it was eligible for me to leave my Uncle's (Mr. Taylor's) curacy, and remove to another, that of Worth, about six miles from East-Grinstead, Sussex.—The parish was thirty miles in circumference. Mr. Hopkins, hearing that a *young Arian*, (for I always scorned to disguise my theological opinions, and, without reserve, professed what I believed to be the truth), with his wife, was situated in the parsonage of Worth, embraced the first opportunity to make me a visit. When two nominal heretics meet, you, Sir, are capable of conceiving the mutual, heartfelt satisfaction they enjoy in each other's company and conversation. After the first salutations had passed, I do suppose that we talked as many hours together as Falstaff boasts he fought by Shrewsbury Clock. Mr. Hopkins introduced me to another Arian, the Rev. Mr. Bristed, rector of Slaugham, Sussex, and a native of Shaftesbury, Dorset. Here, by the bye, I must observe, that, at that time, the year 1762, all social intercourse with Arian-Christians was most scrupulously avoided by rigid, bigoted Athanasian-Trinitarians, and more so, I should hope, than is the case at present, with Unitarian Christians, who advocate the strict, literal, only humanity of Christ. But be that as it may, our Arian triumvirate sought mutual improvement, without the least uncharitable censure of our antagonists. As Messrs. Hopkins and Bristed were elderly men, and pains-taking, free investigators of gospel-truths, and I a mere tyro-theologus, I profited much by their superior knowlege and experience, like Timothy, Paul's young "son in the faith." I was delighted to find Mr. Bristed an excellent Hebræan. Convinced by the arguments of his learned friend, the Rev. Dr. Gregory Sharpe, late master of the Temple, advanced in his valuable "Dissertation on the Origin and Affinity of Languages," that the Masorites had invented the *vowel-points*, with a view to perplex the Christians in the pronunciation of the language, Mr. Bristed had totally discarded them, retaining only the *mappik*, thus ˙, which doubles a consonant. After the Dr. he made א, ה, י, ע, and ו, the five vowels, ā, ē, i, o, and u, and in pronouncing the incommunicable name of God, יהוה, read Jēvē, or Yēvē, instead of Jehovah. For, as the word consisted of four vowels, it could not be pronounced without making the first and third consonants, for y and v. Unwilling to give up the vowel-points, in which I had been instructed by Dr. Hunt, I solicited from Mr. Bristed the loan of Dr. Sharpe's work, with which he readily complied.—On the perusal I found the Doctor's arguments so sound and satisfactory, that, like Mr. Bristed, I adopted his plan respecting the five vowels, supplying, after his example, the want of a vowel where two consonants meet, with a short a, ă, or rather a short e, ĕ, or epsilon, ε. The Dr's. Dissertation must now probably be out of print, but well deserves to be reprinted for the benefit of the younger clergy, who wish to be proficients in the study of the Hebrew, or rather the Chaldee, characters. During my residence, of nearly three years, in the parsonage of Worth, an intimacy, and consequently an agreeable interchange of visits, took place between Messrs. Hopkins and Bristed and myself. Mr. Hopkins married the widow of a carpenter, who had a daughter by her former husband, both whom I have seen, as also his only child, a son, by her. He resided at Cuckfield, a market-town, and officiated on Sundays, morning and afternoon, alternately, at his own parish-church of Bolney, and at that of Cuckfield, a short distance from the former.—In my last visit to my worthy friend, from Saturday to Monday, having obtained a supply for my Sunday-duty from a neighbouring clergyman, I mounted the pulpit in his stead, on the afternoon of the Sunday. The congregation was large and respectable. Mr. Hopkins officiated in the desk, and, in reading the Evening Service, altered parts of the Liturgy, adapting them to his Arian opinions, and in particular, in the frequently-repeated doxology, "To God the Father," &c. He was so beloved by his parishioners, and by the inhabitants of Cuckfield, that they scorned to *present* him to the bishop, for these alterations. The Right Rev. Sir William Ashburnham, Bart. was then the Diocesan of Chichester. O! what a marked difference between this tolerant treatment, and the intolerance of my prosecutors: condemned, alas! to a deprivation of my rectory, for scorning to violate my engagements with my ordaining bishop, to "teach" the people "nothing but that which I was persuaded might be concluded and proved by the scripture,—and to banish and drive away all doctrines, strange, erroneous and contrary to God's word," taking especial care to abstain from all uncharitable censures of the advocates of such doctrines. Mr. Hopkins, with a species of playful humour, once remarked to me, that the advocates of the Athanasian Trinity in Unity might, with equal plausibility, have cited a passage in the Apocalypse, i. 4, 5, in support of a glorious *Ninity* in Unity. On my quitting the curacy of Worth, in consequence of a presentation to the rectory of Cold-Norton, by the favour of my patrons, the Right Honourable and Right Reverend Governors of the Charter-house, an occasional epistolary correspondence ensued, till, on my successful solicitation of him to join the Association of the clerical petitioners, a renewed personal interview took place in London, when I enjoyed the satisfaction of introducing him to our brethren at the Feathers Tavern, Strand. It was remarked, by that truly excellent character, Dr. John Jebb, a Cantabrigian, that the Oxford-members of the Association attended the meetings to the very last, alluding to Mr. Hopkins and myself.

---

* The title of the work, an 8vo. vol. of upwards of 500 pages, referred to by Mr. Stone, is as follows,—"The Trinitarian Controversy Reviewed: or, a Defence of the Appeal to the Common Sense of all Christian People, &c., wherein every Particular advanced by the Rev. Dr. M'Donnell, in his Sincere Christian's Answer to the Appeal, is distinctly considered; several other Subjects relative to the Question are discussed; and an humble Attempt is made to put a final Period, if possible, to this Controversy, by a solemn Address to the most judicious Defenders of the Athanasian Trinity. By the Author of the Appeal. London. Millar. 1760." There is subjoined to the volume, an "Examination of the Bishop of London's Discourse upon Philipp. ii. 6—11." The reader will find some biographical particulars of Mr. Hopkins, *Month. Repos.* vol. i. pp. 337—340. ED.

Yours, &c.

FRANCIS STONE.

Historical Account of the Warrington Academy.

[Continued from page 294.]

It has already been observed, that, in the year 1767, an entirely new range of apartments was built in a collegiate form, for the accommodation of the whole body of students, under the immediate inspection of the tutors. This was expected to be attended with great advantages over the former mode of boarding them in separate private houses. To remove all danger of dissatisfaction with any of the tutors, a person unconnected with the conduct of any branch of education, was engaged to provide the commons for the students. And a regular code of laws was drawn up, and a printed copy was given to each of the students, who were explicitly to promise obedience to them. The Trustees besides appointed, in the person of Mr. Seddon, a *Rector Academiæ*, whose particular office it should be to superintend the discipline and morals of the students; and who, in connection with the tutors, should have full power to make such farther regulations as might be judged expedient. An exact weekly register was ordered to be kept, of the violations of the laws; which register was to be read over by the Rector, every Saturday afternoon, publicly, before all the students, and such reprimands and admonitions to be given by him and the other tutors, as to them should seem necessary: if such admonitions did not prove effectual, the tutors were to proceed to appoint the delinquents a proper exercise, and on no account to dispense with the performance of it. A report from these weekly registers was to be drawn up and sent once a quarter to the Committee, who were to cause such reports to be forwarded to the parents or guardians of the students; and if this should not be effectual, they were to proceed, in the next instance, to expulsion.

On the death of Mr. Seddon,* the congregation of Protestant Dissenters at Warrington, and the Trustees of the academy, concurred in inviting the Rev. William Enfield to be his successor, as pastor to the former, and as Tutor in the Belles Lettres, and *Rector Academiæ* in the latter. The Life of this amiable friend has been already so well written by Dr. Aikin, that the present writer will best satisfy his readers, by a short abridgment of that excellent piece of biography,† with the addition, as he proceeds, of a few remarks, particularly on academical concerns.

The Rev. William Enfield, LL. D., was born at Sudbury in Suffolk, March 29th, 1741, of parents in humble life, but respectable for their virtues. His amiable dispositions and promising parts, recommended him to Mr. Hextal, the minister of the place, who directed his education, and greatly contributed to the purity of his style, and the general elegance of his turn of thought, by leading him to an early acquaintance with our best poets, particularly Akenside. He passed through his academical course at Daventry, and immediately after its conclusion, settled as Pastor to the congregation at Benn's Garden, Liverpool, where he was ordained, in Nov. 1763; a few years after he married a lady who still survives him. In 1768 and 1770, he published two volumes of Sermons, the easy elegance and pleasing moral strain of which recommended them to the adoption, it has been shrewdly suspected, of many other preachers besides their author. In the latter year he also published a volume of Prayers for Families, which have been frequently reprinted. In this year, also, he removed, as has been above-stated, to a situation in several respects flattering to a young man fond of literary society, and ambitious of a proper field for the display of his talents. For his qualifications as a lecturer on the Belles Lettres there could be no question: but of his fitness for the office of *Rector Academiæ*, there might be some grounds for doubt. Whatever could be accomplished by amiable dispositions and pleasing manners, might well be expected; but, in emergencies, where firmness, resolution and dignified severity were requisite, there was reason to apprehend a failure. Accordingly, though, amidst the heterogeneous mass of students in this seminary, he generally engaged the esteem and warm affection of the orderly and sober part, he was not always treated with due respect by those, even among these classes, who had no particular interest in the credit and success of the institution; while by the dissipated and inflamed West Indian, whose pastime it had been from his youth to sport with human sufferings,*—by the profligate outcast of our great public schools, who had learned all the evil, without any of the good, of those establishments, and was sent hither as a sort of *dernier resort*,—and by the pampered petling of large fortune, who, from the treatment he had seen given, and been allowed himself to give, to his private tutor at home, had learned to consider every tutor as a sort of upper servant,—he was sometimes treated with a degree of scornful insolence, which nothing but a forbearance like his could tolerate, and which it required the occasional co-operation of the other tutors effectually to check. So much, however, did he feel his tranquillity hurt, by the scenes of this kind to which he was exposed that this was probably a principal cause of the violent dyspeptic complaints, under which he frequently laboured. He made several attempts to deliver him from this burden, and, after the failure of repeated attempts to obtain a successor in this department, he addressed a strong remonstrance to the Trustees, which put an end to the institution.

---

* This, the author has since been informed, from the best authority, that of a relation and a friend, who was with him to the last, was not by a fever, but by an apoplectic stroke, which seized him while on horseback; he survived his fall only eight hours, shewing marks of his usual affectionate disposition to the last moment. He was born Dec. 8, 1724, ordained at Warrington Dec. 8, 1747, and died Jan. 22, 1770.

† Enfield's Posthumous Sermons, vol. i. p. 1—27.

Though the life of Dr. Enfield was toilsome and anxious through the whole period of his residence at Warrington, it was one of rapid mental improvement; for it was one of constant and unremitted mental exertion.

As a Lecturer on the subjects connected with his proper department,* Dr. E. had great merit. The subjects which composed his several courses, were arranged with great judgment, and each subject was treated with accuracy and distinctness. Though perhaps there might not be much original, yet whatever had been advanced of importance by others, was diligently collected, and luminously displayed, and expressed of course in elegant language. In one respect he was deficient; he was a mere lecturer; no examination on the subject of the former lecture preceded the delivery of the next, nor were any sufficient pains taken to ascertain whether the student had attended to or understood the subject.—On Saturdays, indeed, he had a regular practical exercise, to improve the students under his care in reading, speaking and composition; the exercises for which latter purpose were often directed to be on subjects connected with their studies.—And, in order to encourage among the students at large, an alacrity to engage in voluntary exercises, he, in conjunction with his friend, Mr. (now Dr.) Aikin, who settled at Warrington as a surgeon, shortly after Dr. Enfield, promoted the formation of societies or clubs for improvement in elocution and composition: they both became themselves members of these clubs, and took their turns in submitting to general discussion essays of their own. These clubs, which continued for many years, were eminently useful, both in forming the young men to a just and natural elocution, and in training them to a habit of spontaneously expressing their sentiments on any subject with ease and propriety. While their presence secured a due decorum among the younger members in the management of their debates, "their easy manners checked no sober freedoms," but allowed to every one the full exercise of that liberty of declaring his own sentiments on any side of a question, which is necessary to its fair investigation and decision.

---

* One of this class who was at Warrington with the present writer, used to say, that the first request of the children of planters to their parents was for "*a young neger to kick!*" Young negroes, it is hoped, are, since the abolition, grown too valuable to be thus sported with.

* His course continued during three years, and consisted of Lectures on the Theory of Language, particularly the English; on Composition, comprising the various subjects usually included under the term Belles Lettres; on Elocution; on History, including Geography and Chronology, and on Commerce

Dr. Enfield's power of turning his mind to any subject, and by dint of hard labour making himself master of it, together with his earnest good-will to the prosperity of the academy, often without being much thanked for it, and always without being rewarded as he deserved, will appear from the following circumstance. On Mr. Walker's resignation of the mathematical chair, it was found impracticable to give adequate encouragement to a separate tutor in that department; Dr. Enfield had paid little attention to it, and it was by no means a favourite branch of science; but by the hard study of one vacation, under the direction of his friend, Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Clayton, of Liverpool, he qualified himself to set out with one class, and advancing in the science in proportion to the demand, he became a very respectable teacher in all the parts which usually come into an academical course. His Institutes of Natural Philosophy is a work of very considerable reputation.

But it was not only as a tutor that Dr. Enfield employed his talents during his residence at Warrington, he greatly extended his reputation as a writer. His sermon at the ordination of Mr. Philip Taylor, of Liverpool, and of Mr. Robert Gore, of Manchester, 1770, gives a pleasing view of the duties of Christian societies. His Preacher's Directory, (1771) is an elaborate and useful work, which must have been long in preparation, though published after he became a tutor; it contains a series of subjects for public addresses from the pulpit, arranged under proper heads,—the Existence and Attributes of God—Virtue and Vice in general; the particular Duties of Piety; the Social and the Personal duties;—Christianity; its evidences, excellence, advantages, prospects, peculiar institutions, &c. Historical subjects;—Particular Occasions. These general heads are branched out into almost every possible variety of particulars, each illustrated by a collection of texts from the Old and New Testaments, and from the Apocrypha. To the whole is prefixed a judicious Essay on Preaching, which has been much and deservedly commended.* It will be found, indeed, to be a very useful companion to every young preacher. His English Preacher, (1773) in 9 vols. is a valuable selection of sermons, from various authors. His History of Liverpool, (1774), is a neat topographical sketch, compiled from papers collected by a deceased friend. His Observations on Literary Property, (1774), is an elegant declamatory pleading in favour of the rights of authors. His Speaker, (1774), compiled for the immediate use of his pupils, has proved one of the most popular and profitable books in the language: its sequel, the Exercises in Elocution, is an equally elegant and pleasing, but not so successful, compilation. To the first was prefixed an Essay on Elocution, and in subsequent editions, an Essay on reading Works of Taste; and to the later editions of the second were added, Counsels for Young Men. His Biographical Sermons, (1777), are pleasing sketches of the most eminent scripture-characters, but have not been thought in general to display the talent which might have been expected from their author. His Funeral Sermon for Mr. Galway, a student of great promise, who died the same year in the academy, is a powerful and impressive address to his fellow-students, under the immediate impression of so awful an event, which could hardly fail of being attended with a beneficial effect. His Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Estlin, of Bristol, (1778) is an able appeal to Protestant Dissenters, on the necessity of a manly and spirited attention to their common interests. There are some circumstances connected with this discourse, which, if the writer were at liberty to mention them, would shew its author's spirit and temper in a particularly amiable point of view. The first of Three Discourses, by Enfield, Godwin and Holland, (1780), has furnished your last volume (p. 293—226) with a very interesting article. All the three, indeed, are very interesting discourses, and deserved much more attention from the public than they met with.* His Sermon on the Death of Dr. Aikin has already been mentioned, p. 170. For his mathematical class, besides his Institutes, he translated Rossignol's Elements of Geometry.

---

* Robinson's Claude, vol. i. p. 209.

After the dissolution of the academy, he continued at Warrington two years, taking the charge of a few pupils, and devoting his attention more closely than he had before done, to the service of his congregation: for whose use he now drew up a series of discourses, on the principal incidents and moral precepts of the gospel, in which he shewed considerable talent as a commentator, as well as skill in expanding into general lessons of conduct, those incidental hints and observations which occur in the sacred narrative. As a preacher his delivery was grave and impressive, affecting rather a tenor of uniform dignity, than any great variety of expression; though not highly animated, it was by no means dull, and never careless or indifferent. Of the usual tenor of his discourses, we have a good opportunity of judging, in his three volumes of Posthumous Sermons; though his general character is that of a moral preacher, it is that of a *Christian* moralist; and though his religion was rather that of principle than of sentiment, and he was more solicitous to deduce from it a rule of life, than to elevate it into a source of sublime and rapturous feelings, yet he was desirous to enforce his rule, by the peculiar sanctions of the gospel. Scarcely any writer has entered with more delicacy, into the minute and nice discriminations of virtue and vice; he has not only delineated the path of the strictly just, but at the same time of the amiable and becoming; and has aimed at rendering mankind not only mutually serviceable, but also mutually agreeable. From his excellent discourses, in the third volume, on our Lord's conversations—with the young man, with the woman of Samaria, and with his disciples, before his crucifixion,—we may see that his theological system was purged of every mysterious and unintelligible proposition, and that he had a thorough acquaintance with the proper Unitarian doctrine respecting the person of Christ, the personality of the Holy Spirit, &c. and knew how to make a judicious application of them.

---

* The second, indeed, by Mr. Godwin, containing a comparative view of the Dissenters of the last and present age, has been noticed by Wendeborn, in his "View of England," vol. ii. p. 359. Mr. Holland's is reprinted in his Posthumous Sermons; and can scarcely be too much commended.

In the earlier part of his life Dr. Enfield, perhaps, might occasionally wish, that no insuperable bar should exist to an entrance into the established church; and entertain more sanguine hopes of the success of the petitioners, for a relief from subscription, than the event at least justified. To dissent was no part of his natural disposition; his mild and amiable disposition disposed him rather to regard the conformities than the differences between religious parties and sects. Under these impressions he, for a time, disapproved the conduct of those who, as he conceived, were widening the breach, by calling men to an attention to the rights of conscience, and to the assertion and exercise of a perfect freedom of enquiry and profession. He lived, however, to see all his expectations frustrated, to see hierarchical claims asserted more dogmatically than ever, and the chief stress of religion placed upon those doctrines in which the articles of the Church of England most differ from the opinions of that class of Dissenters with whom he most agreed. He became, therefore, a more decided separatist than ever: the rights of individual judgment and public discussion, and all the fundamental points of civil and religious liberty, became more and more dear to him; with a rare magnanimity, he acknowledged his former error, recommended those books which he had before disapproved, and took every opportunity of shewing his respect and approbation of that distinguished person, to whose conduct he had most objected, and who certainly had treated him with no particular respect. He even asserted the principles of liberty with a courage and zeal which seemed scarcely to belong to his habitual temper. Besides the sermon at Bristol, mentioned above, a very manly discourse, which he published on the hundredth anniversary of the Revolution, sufficiently testifies his sentiments on these subjects. In 1785 he removed from Warrington to Norwich, and for a short time took a few pupils, but as his family grew up, he devoted all his leisure time to them, and they have amply repaid his cares. He occasionally gave public lectures on natural philosophy, and was eminently useful in the management of a public library, and as a member of a literary society: the fruits of his labours for which appeared in the series of essays published in the Monthly Magazine under the title of the Inquirer.*

While at Norwich, he undertook and executed the most laborious, and, perhaps the most important, of his works, the Abridgment of Burcker's History of Philosophy. The original work is in six closely printed 4to volumes, of a thousand pages each, in high repute among the learned for the depth of its researches and the liberality of its spirit; but its Latin style is involved and prolix, and the heaviness that pervades the whole, renders it rather a work for consultation than direct perusal. Dr. Enfield's abridgment is a work equally instructive and pleasing; and it may be pronounced that the tenets of all the leading sects of philosophers were never before displayed with such elegance and perspicuity. Here he also commenced, in conjunction with his friend Dr. Aikin, that excellent work, the General Biographical Dictionary, of which he lived to see one volume published, and another nearly ready for publication. But an incurable disease was making unsuspected advances; and after a week's sickness, with his faculties entire to the last, foreseeing the fatal event, and meeting it with Christian fortitude, he sunk in the arms of his family and friends, and expired without a struggle, Nov. 3, 1797, in the 57th year of his age. It was the essence of his character to be amiable. He loved mankind, and wished nothing so much as to render them the worthy objects of love. This was the object of all his writings; which breathe the very spirit of his gentle and generous mind.

V. F.

EXTRACTS FROM NEW PUBLICATIONS.

State of Religion amongst the Modern Greeks.

[From "A Journey through Albania, and other Provinces of Turkey in Europe and Asia, to Constantinople, during the years 1809 and 1810. By J C. Hobhouse. Cawthorn. 1813." (4to. nearly 1200 pp. 5l. 5s.) pp. 519—534.]

The traveller, especially he that has left behind him the enlightened freedom of the English capital, and the decent ceremonies of the Protestant church, when he beholds the religious system of the Greeks, must be prompted to suppose himself carried back into the darkest ages of ignorance and superstition. There is something sacred in every observance attached to any Christian worship, which ought to preserve it from contempt and ridicule, yet the rites of this church have in them such an air of absurdity, and are performed with what we should consider such a want of solemnity, that it is not easy to refrain from smiling during the celebration of the mass. The chief part of the service seems to consist of frequent crossing, performed with the thumb laid on the two fore-fingers, and ten thousand repetitions of "Lord have mercy upon me," sung through the nose, and, apparently, kept up as long as the breath of the chanter will last. It is some time before you can make out the words they are repeating, which, though you may have supposed them a continued psalm or lesson, are only "Lord have mercy upon me; Lord have mercy upon me; Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon me, a sinner." — *Κύριε ἐλεήσον, Κυριε ἐλεήσον, Κύριε Ιησοῦ Χριστὲ ἐλεήσον με τὸν ἁμαρτολὸν.*

---

* It might have been mentioned, that he is understood to have been for many years considerably engaged as a writer for the Monthly Review.

There is, at the same time, a degree of primitive simplicity in most of the churches, which recalls our recollections to the earliest ages of Christianity. They are very small generally, the floor of mud, the altar of stone, the sanctuary separated from the nave by deal boards, and an enclosure of pales at the other end for the women. It is but seldom that there are any seats, but in one corner of the building there is an assortment of crutches, on one of which each of the more aged worshippers supports himself, leaning on his arms and chin, in the posture of one of the figures in the cartoon of Paul preaching before Felix.

In the great towns, as you have heard, and in some of the monasteries, the churches are better fitted up, though in the most paltry style, covered with gilt daubings, and ornamented with pictures of saints, whose only value arises from their supposed miraculous powers.

It would be difficult to meet amongst the laity with a single person at all sceptical on the article of religion; they all seem most attached to the ceremonies, and strictly to observe the ordinances of their church, which are very strict and severe. There are only one hundred and thirty-nine days in the year free from all fasts. The Easter Lent lasts two months, the Christmas forty days, and there are two others, the Lent of St. Peter and St. Paul, and that of the Virgin; besides which, Wednesdays and Fridays are fasts throughout the year. The Caloyers have three other lents, which last in the whole forty-eight days more.

The clergy enjoy a most unbounded influence with their flock, and it is painful to see the sacrifices which the meagre, half-starved peasants make to their priests. Besides many gifts, there are certain days when all the attendants, men and women, of the poorest class bring loaves and plates of sweetmeats, called a *colyva* and wax tapers, and lay them, during the service, at the foot of the altar, whence they are conveyed into the sanctuary, and serve as the evening's feast for the priests. The colyva is a quantity of boiled wheat, covered with currants, and garnished with pomegranate-seeds, sugar, comfits, sesamum and sweet basil. The Greek girls carry presents of these colyvas, and other sweet-meats, on twelfth-day, which they call *πολυκερίον*, to their friends; and in some other respects, the amusements and religion of this people seem as much connected as in ancient times. They dance in honour of some of their saints, and on the feast of the Epiphany, bands of fiddlers and other musicians, patrole the streets from morning to night.

This feast, by accident, whilst we were at Athens, fell on the same day as the second Bairam of the Turks, the 17th of January, and the Mahometans were firing cannon and discharging skyrockets, from the Acropolis, with the sound of drums and pipes, at the same time that the Christians were manifesting their glee to commemorate another event, in every street of the city below.

This oppressed people would find life too long and burthensome, were it not for their religious festivals, and accordingly they have retained much of the joyful part of the ceremony attached even to the funeral rites of their ancestors. On the death of any person of dignity, the body is dressed in a rich garment, and laid upon a litter, strewed with flowers, and covered with a rich canopy, and the corpse, with the face displayed, is left a short time in the vestibule of the house, surrounded by the family of the deceased. At the stated time, the procession sets forward. The servants of the household move two and two before the bier, which is borne on poles at a little height from the ground. The male relations and the priests immediately precede the body. On each side of the bier are two or three old women lamenting aloud, detailing the dignities and virtues of the deceased, and interrogating him, as to his reasons for quitting the world.—"Why did you die? You had money, you had friends, you had a fair wife, and many children,—why did you die?" These mourners are hired, and the common pay of each is five loaves, four jars of wine, half a cheese, a quarter of mutton, and about fifteen pence in money. Their howling is extremely ludicrous, and has not even the semblance of grief. Behind the body is a long train of the female relations and friends, muffled up in mourning habits. If the dead be a young woman, several girls in white precede and follow the bier, and at intervals scatter real or artificial flowers on the body.

At Constantinople, or rather at Pera, the distance to the burying-ground is considerable, and gives time for large bodies of followers to collect and accompany the procession to the tomb. Arrived at the place of interment, the bier is set down, a short service read, and the body deposited, with its dress, and rolled in a winding-sheet, in the grave, the mourners continuing to howl most piteously during this last ceremony. The garlands that adorned the bier are some of them thrown into the grave, and others carried home by the mourners and friends.

Afterwards, and generally on the ninth day after the funeral, a feast is prepared by the nearest relation, accompanied with music and dancing, and every other species of merriment. But the priest gain the most by these festive demonstrations of grief. They are supplied always on the ninth day, and frequently also during the mourning, with large colyvas, which present is repeated also for three or four anniversaries of the burial.

You may have before seen it observed, that there is a remarkable conformity between some customs of the Irish and of the Greeks. The funerals of the two nations bear the strongest similarity to each other, though the lower classes alone of the former people preserve that part of the ceremony which, amongst the latter nation, is peculiarly attached to the wealthy and important; for according to a modern Greek saying, "a rich man is wept by hired mourners, a poor man by his friends." But a more singular resemblance is that which is to be remarked between a Mahometan and Irish opinion, relative to the same ceremony. When a dead Mussulman is carried on his plank towards the cemetery, the devout Turk runs from his house as the procession passes his door, and, for a short distance, relieves one of the bearers of the body, and then gives up his place to another, who hastens to perform the same charitable and holy office. It is a belief enjoined by Mahomet himself, that to carry a body forty paces gives expiation of sin.

No one who has been in Ireland but must have seen the peasants leave their cottages, or their work, to give a temporary assistance to those employed in bearing the dead to the grave, an exertion by which they approach so many steps nearer to Paradise.*

The cemeteries of the Greeks are not in their churches, nor in the precincts of any city, but at a little distance from the town, in a space, not enclosed by a wall, near the high road. The tombstones are some raised, some flat, and they are generally in a thin grove of cypress or yew tress. On certain days they are frequented by the relations of those who are lately dead, when, after a few tears, and the depositing of a garland and a small lock of hair on the grave, the parties assume their accustomed liveliness, and spend the remainder of the visit in dancing and singing.

The clergy are divided into two classes, the Caloyers, or Monks of the order of St. Basil, from whom all the prelates are chosen, and the Papades, or secular priests, who may marry, if they choose a virgin, and engage before ordination. Caloyers never say mass; if they take the priesthood, they become what is called "Holy Monks," and only officiate on high festivals. Admission to the brotherhood is gained by applying to one of these Holy Monks, and paying sixty or seventy piasters, no probation or examination is requisite, and very young children are allowed to put on the cowl.

There are many inducements to belong to this religious fraternity. The priests are all powerful with their flock, and enjoy some respect even from the Turks. It is better to be a wealthy man at large than a monk, but it is better to be a well-fed recluse than a hungry vagrant.

The first solitaries, the voluntary tenants of the burning deserts of Nitria, selected the most barren spots for their retreats; but the monks and hermits of the Greek church, in the present age, have not objected to abridge themselves of some of their meritorious mortifications, and, besides other advantages, have seated themselves in all the most beautiful spots to be found in Greece. The only establishment they possess in Italy, is situated as judiciously amongst the woods and gardens of Monte Dracone, near Frescati. The place is called Grotta Ferrata, and stands on the site of the Tusculan villa of Cicero.

---

* A person who reads Mons Galand's "Paroles Remarquables des Orientaux," would be surprised, perhaps, to find, that the famous *bull* recorded of an Irishman who, looking over a person writing a letter, and seeing that he put —' I would be more particular, but a tall blackguard of an Irishman is behind my chair, and reads every word I say," exclaimed, " You lie, you rascal," is an Oriental story. The same book mentions two or three other good things, which are also to be found in our jest-books, applied to very modern characters.

> The marble porch, where wisdom wont
> to talk
> With Socrates or Tully, hears no more,
> Save the hoarse jargon of contentious
> monks,

In their own country, their monasteries are frequent objects in the valleys, the forests, and on the slopes and summits of almost every hill, and are contrived as well for comfort as security; their farms tenanted by one of their order, or a lay-brother, are scattered over the whole country.

Notwithstanding the fasts, when their prescribed diet is pulse, roots and plain water, and their rising to pray an hour and a half after midnight, they seem almost the only sleek and well-fed people amongst the Greeks, and convince one how lavishly

> Dieu prodigue des biens
> A ceux qui font vieu d'être siens.

The purest wine, the clearest honey, olives, dried fruit, wheaten bread, can always be procured in their habitations, and in their's alone; nor is it easy to account for the plumpness of their appearance, without supposing them occasionally to transgress the rules of their order. There are to be met with some more abstemious anchorets, who live three or four together, and now and then an ascetic, who passes his time in a solitary cell.

The monks are supported partly by the lands attached to their monastery, and partly by the voluntary contributions of their believing flock. On particular days, they carry about with them little pictures of their saints and a jar of holy water, with a brush, and entering the Christian houses, give their votaries the one to kiss, and make a mark of the cross on their foreheads with the other, receiving a para or two from each person.

The most sanctified of the Caloyers are those who have received their education in the monasteries of Athos, the Holy Mountain (Ἅγιος Ορος), which, by an institution of which there is no parallel in history, swarms with six thousand saints. The theological studies of these recluses are not so severe as their bodily labour; for not only do they cultivate the ground, and attend to the vineyards and orchards, but even build fishing-vessels, and exercise many mechanical trades, some of them undertaking to spin and weave. The monasteries of Patmos are also in great repute, and mendicant brothers from them, as well as from Mount Athos, are to be met with throughout Greece, dispensing their sacred favours, and, amongst other absurdities, even administering by anticipation the extreme unction to the healthy inhabitants of a whole house.

The Papades are not held in such estimation as the Caloyers, and though they are certainly more serviceable, have every appearance of being more wretched than the recluses. A deacon enters into priest's orders by a kind of public election, for being produced to the congregation at church, the officiating papas asks the audience if he is worthy, on which, if the acclamation of all declares him worthy, (and the cry is always *ἄξιος, ἄξιος*), he is considered as duly qualified to commence his holy functions.

There is a chapel for almost every priest, it being considered a kind of spiritual adultery for any man to officiate out of his own place of worship. It is this that has multiplied the number of churches in Greece. In Athens alone there are forty churches, besides a hundred and fifty chapels, and those in all Attica amount to four thousand; but this includes every consecrated cavern with a door to it and a stone altar.

Some writers have represented the monasteries as the abodes of every vice, and, as it appeared to me, with great injustice. As to the accomplishments of those in holy orders, they must be considerably improved during the last century, if it be true, as Tournefort says, "that," in his time, "'twas great merit in the clergy to read," and "that scarce twelve men in the empire understood ancient Greek." Belon had before said, that only two or three of all the thousands on Mount Athos, knew their letters.* The only persons of liberal sentiments, with respect to religion, with whom I met in Greece, were a bishop and two hadjis, or priests, who had been to Jerusalem. The more one knows and sees, the less one believes and admires. This bishop had initiated himself so deeply into the mysteries of his faith, that he began to despise them, and the hadjis who had seen the holy city, declared that it was not worth going to see, nor worth seeing, regretting the thousand piastres they had each spent upon their pilgrimage.

The generality of the priesthood are certainly most ignorant, stupid, and inactive, and to increase their gains, encourage the rest of the people in superstitions so absurd, that it is difficult to think that they believe them themselves. It is too true that to them may be, in a great measure, attributed the debasement of the Greeks, or at least the continuation of that people in their present state of mental impotence. According to them, the world is still full of wonders, and the devil possesses an active and apparent influence over the bodies and souls of men. Thus there are many E'*νεργουμενοι* or Possessed, and the exorcising of these unfortunate persons is a frequent and profitable employment for the priests.

The Athenians are, of all the Greeks, the most credulous, or inclined to invent ridiculous stories on this subject. They all, as was said before of the women, believe in the power of magic, and work up their imaginations to such a pitch, as to fancy themselves actually the sufferers by the incantations of some malevolent enemy. If a girl has two suitors, it is by no means uncommon for the unsuccessful lover when his rival's marriage takes place to have recourse to charms as a last resource. He ties the locks of his hair with a certain form of words,† and by every knot defers the bridegroom's happiness for a night; the tremendous operation is made known, and the unhappy husband, through credulity and shame, becomes not unfrequently the accomplice in effecting his own misfortune. An archon at Athens, whom we well knew, suffered this calamity for the first month of his marriage, and was only released from the bonds of the spell by the repeated prayers, images, and holy water of his chaplain.

---

* See Roy's Collection of curious Voyages and Travels, Tom. xv. cap. ii. p. 9.

† "I tie A and B, and the Devil in the middle."

Several of the houses at Athens are believed to be haunted by a spirit which is called an Arabin; the moans of one of them were frequently heard from the bottom of a well belonging to the house under the Acropolis, in which Mr. Lusieri was lodged, and it was not always easy to persuade the servants of the family to draw water from the enchanted spring.

Whether the Turks have been infected by the Greeks with their superstitions, or brought their fables with them into Europe, they have belief in these fairies also, and denominate them "Gins." We saw at Libokavo a large house belonging to a Turk entirely deserted, the court and garden overrun with weeds, and were told that no one would live there as it was haunted by the Gins. The operations of these beings are much the same as those of our ghosts; they create strange noises, and disarrange all the household furniture, but are seldom seen.

Panagia, or the all-holy virgin, is the favourite of the Greeks; the Minerva of the modern Athenians. There is scarcely a cottage in which her picture, with a lamp burning before it, is not seen in a niche of the wall, or in a wooden case. The making and ornamenting of these images is a gainful trade; and sometimes you meet with one of them very neatly executed. A lavish Englishman offered fifty zequins for a saint, I think Demetrius, to a painter at Athens, and was refused.

A peasant who lived at Athens told me a strange story. I was riding in the island of Salamis, and observed a strong young man running by the side of my attendant's horse, with a little box in his hand in which he had apparently collected charity. Inquiring the nature of his petition, he told me with tears in his eyes, and with the most solemn asseverations of the truth of his story, that, for some offence, of which he was not aware, the virgin with the infant in her arms, and otherwise so accoutred as not to be mistaken by him, appeared before him every night, and jumping on his bed nearly throttled him. He had been to the priest, who could do nothing for him, but observing that the picture of his Panagia appeared rather shabby and worn, suggested that the terrible visitation might not be renewed if the image was adorned with fresh gilding. "I have no money myself," continued the Athenian, "but am going to Ampelaki and Colouri, to beg a few piastres, to pay the painter for his gold." I gave him a trifle, and my attendant, a good-humoured fellow, and a saint-maker by trade at Athens, told the man that he would gild his picture for him at a cheaper rate than he had ever done for any body before.

In the reign of Theodosius the Second, Gamaliel appeared to Lucian, a presbyter of Jerusalem, and told him that himself and St. Stephen wished to be released from the obscure grave in which they had been buried in a neighbouring field.*

Since that time revelations of this sort have been frequent; and St. Nicholas delivered a similar message to a woman whilst we were at Athens. The holy apparition told the lady that he was roaming about in a church, which had fallen and was buried under ground, from which he desired to be delivered, and pointed out the spot where they were to dig and effect his release. Accordingly the next day the lady, who was at once regarded as a saint for having been thought worthy of such a communication, accompanied by a large party, consisting of the most respectable archons and priests, walked in procession to the place described, and pitched upon a part of the road west of that going to the Piræus, and leading to the gardens, about half a mile from the town. After digging a short time in two places, they came to some bits of painted tile, which may be found almost any where near Athens, and especially in this quarter, the old site of the Ceramicus without the city. Immediately there was a cry of the church! the church! (eklesia! eklesia!)—all the crowd began crossing themselves—candles were burnt before the holes—and an opulent Greek, possessed of the land immediately close to the road-side, made a present of it to the saint, to be dug away, in order to give him a freer egress, and to lay open the whole church.

There was a commotion at Athens on account of this discovery, and the road would have been entirely cut up in the course of this religious search, had not the Turks prudently interfered, and prevented all farther excavations. As it was, however, the spot was for many days watched by crowds of pious worshippers, and, whilst I was present, a sort of controversy took place as to the respective merits of the two apertures, one of which was at last deserted, and all the tapers were burnt out before the other opening in the ground. An old woman most earnestly appealed to me to tell her which was the real church; when, as gravely as was in my power, I told her that they were under a sad mistake, and that the cavity which they had deserted was, in fact, the true church of St. Nicholas. The intelligence was immediately spread amongst the crowd, that the Frank had decided in favour of the other spot, and immediately the tapers were all carried off to the deserted place, and all the crossing, bowing, and praying, were directed to the hole in the ground which had been before neglected. The Greeks had listened to my decision; for Franks are thought by them to possess a preternatural, but by no means an enviable, degree of knowledge, communicated to them by the Evil Principle, their master and guide. The children in the streets when one of them is passing, call out, "Franco di Dio! Franco di Dio!" by which, though I know not how the sentence is supplied, they mean, "Godless Frank! Godless Frank!"

The abhorrence of the Franks, which the division of the churches, and the conduct of the Latins, created in the bosoms of the Greeks, is still in some measure preserved by the spirit of bigotry; and the mass of the people do not fancy that there are in the world any true Christians except themselves and the Russians. As for the English they contend they are not Christians at all. If asked of what religion we are, they say, "We do not know, perhaps of none; some call you Lutherans; it is certain you are not Christians, you do not cross yourselves" (*δὲν κάμνετε τὸ σταυρὸ*). A respectable person addressed this argument to myself. The Turks have pretty much the same opinion of us; and seeing that we show none of the external signs of reverence for Panagia, or other pictures, conclude us to be altogether such infidels as themselves.

---

* Decline and Fall, Vol. iii.

A party of us were standing at the back part of a Roman Catholic chapel at Pera, whilst the service was going on at the other end. Just as the host was elevated, a Turk looked in at the door, and seeing the congregation paying their reverence to the wafer, threw up his head with a look of infinite pity and contempt, at the same time smiling, and giving a shrug at us who were standing, as if he said, "What must you and I think of these poor fools?"

The English have no place for public worship at Pera, and may, therefore, be thought never to pray at all; service, however, has been once or twice performed, in the ambassador's palace. But the ministers of Catholic nations sometimes go in procession to mass.

Notwithstanding the disdain entertained by the Turks for the Christian religion, they grant their protection to the Greek clergy, and find it their interest to ratify the ordination of the great dignitaries of the church. Mahomet the Great presented to the first Patriarch chosen in his reign, the same gifts as the Emperors of the Greeks had formerly given; and, to this day, that sovereign priest is invested in a triumphant manner by a minister of the Porte, who assists him in taking possession of the patriarchal church in that quarter of Constantinople called Balat. His influence with the Porte is very great, and his applications to the Sultan are generally effectual: he can punish with death.

The dignity is now exposed to sale, costing about sixty thousand crowns, and the patriarch indemnifies himself by selling every lucrative place, the patriarchates of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, and all the archbishoprics within his jurisdiction. The Greeks themselves were the beginners of this practice, and the first patriarch so elected ejected the incumbent by force; a custom of which there are now frequent examples.

Although the whole of the patriarch's usual revenue does not amount to more than three thousand pounds, yet he has occasionally, by fines and extortions, the means of increasing his income. The richest bishops have not more than three hundred pounds a year. I find by the registry of a parish in Yorkshire, that subscriptions were made in the beginning of Charles the First's reign, for the relief of the Greek church.

The synod of Constantinople, composed of the three patriarchs and twelve archbishops, meets every month for the management of church affairs, the only affairs now left at the absolute disposal of the Greeks.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Dr. Toulmin on the Biography of Dr. Robertson—Occasional Papers—Socinian Tracts.

Birmingham, June 3, 1813.

SIR,

In the Numbers of your valuable Repository of memorials for the history of Unitarianism, and for the biography of the individual advocates of a doctrine so honourable to the unrivalled supremacy of the one God and Father of all, you have afforded a place for a Memoir of the Rev. Dr. W. Robertson, vol. i. p. 169—172, and p. 225—229, and p. 281—285. When those articles were drawn up the writer was not furnished with the worthy man's letter to the Bishop of Ferns, on declining to accept the benefice to which he was handsomely presented by that prelate; he could, therefore, give your readers a part of it only, the essential part indeed, but as a much-esteemed friend has lately handed to him a copy of the whole, though with the omission of a few words, it may be an acceptable addition to that memoir, if you will favour it with a corner in your miscellany. It will also probably awaken the attention of some of your readers to advert, with some good effect, to the pages devoted to the history of that excellent man.

The writer of that biography would embrace this opportunity to submit it to the consideration of the committees of the different Unitarian Tract Societies, whether they would not render important aid to the design of their associations by concurring in a new and cheap edition of Dr. Robertson's "Attempt to explain the words Reason, Substance, Creed, Person, &c." with the Memoirs, under your permission, prefixed to it. It is a piece well-adapted to convey instruction and information, in union with judicious remarks, and a liberal devotional spirit, to a mass of readers, who have not the time or means of searching for it in the volumes of ecclesiastical history.

The pen being in his hand your correspondent avails himself of the opportunity to meet some inquiries that have appeared in recent numbers of your publication; and which he observes have not yet been noticed by any other communications to you.

Vol. vii. p. 751, CRITO asks of some one of your correspondents, an account of the *Occasional Papers,* "of which Dr. Watts speaks very highly." CRITO, probably, was not aware that Dr. Law, the learned and liberal Bishop of Carlisle, in his "Theory of Religion," p. 153, 4th ed. pointed it out to attention "as a work almost forgotten, but *well deserving* a new edition." Nor, it may be concluded, was he sensible that a similar inquiry had been, some years since, brought forward and answered by him who now wishes to satisfy his inquiries in a periodical work entitled the Protestant Dissenter's Magazine, vol. v. for July 1798, p. 276. It might be sufficient to refer to that publication; but as it may not be at hand to be consulted by him or others who are interested in the question, a renewal of the information there given may be not only acceptable but deemed obliging. It is to be regretted that the information was defective, and more perfect is not, I suppose to be procured, as no one came forward at that time to supply the defects of it; and such as it was it was not obtained but by personal communication sought, at the writer's desire, by his ever-esteemed friend, the Rev. Thomas Watson, of Bridgewater, from the lips of Dr. Flexman, with whom perished stores of literary and biographical intelligence. The communication now alluded to, went to the following particulars: "Occasional Paper." Vol. i. No. 1, The Paper on "Bigotry," was was written by Dr. Grosvenor. No. 2, "The character of a Protestant," by Dr. Wright. No. 3, by Dr. Evans. "An Expedient for Peace," by Mr. Simon Browne. No. 6, by Mr. Moses Lowman. Nos. 10 and 12, by Mr. Simon Browne. Vol. ii. No. 1, On Orthodoxy, by Mr. Moses Lowman. Here the writer found that he had reached his *ne plus ultra*, as Dr. Flexman's knowledge or memory had here its limits.

The initials of the names of the writers of these miscellaneous pieces sacred to the cause of religious liberty, free inquiry, and charity, formed the artificial term, BAGWEELL; denoting under this enigmatical form, Browne, Avery, Grosvenor, Wright, Evans, Earl, Lowman, and Lardner: names of great celebrity in their day, and whose talents and character did honour to the cause they espoused and defended.

Some slight information on this subject was given by your present correspondent in the Memoirs of Mr. NEAL, prefixed to the new edition of "The History of the Puritans." p. 32, *note.*

The respondent to Crito wishes that he could furnish a full and particular reply to the inquiries to FILIUS POLONORUM, in your Repository for January last, p. 14. concerning the old Socinian Tracts. He has a collection of them, consisting of *five* volumes, although bound in *three.*

SOCINIAN TRACTS, Vol. i. ii. The general title to the first volume is thus expressed, "THE FAITH OF ONE GOD, who is only the Father; and of one Mediator between God and Man, who is only the Man Christ Jesus; and of one Holy Spirit, the gift (and sent) of God; asserted and defended in several Tracts contained in this Volume, the Titles whereof the Reader will find in the following Leaf. And after that a Preface to the whole or an Exhortation to an impartial and free Inquiry into the Doctrines of Religion." London. Printed in the year 1691, 4to. This volume includes eleven Tracts; the first of which is a Short Account of the Life of Mr. John Bidle. The three next were written by him. The rest are anonymous; each distinctly paged and accompanied with an appropriate title. The last Tract in the volume bears the title of "Observations on the Four Letters of Dr. John Wallis concerning the Trinity and the Creed of Athanasius." After this follow in my copy two blank leaves, which appear to have been intended to separate between the preceding eleven pieces and the next eleven, which are not introduced with any general title, nor with a table of their respective titles: the dates which are expressed are 1692 and 1693.

They are all distinctly paged as not published at first in the collected form of a volume, and some of them have not title-pages; but the leading subjects are specified at the head of the first page. In this series of Tracts is one entitled, "Reflections on Two Discourses concerning the Divinity of our Saviour, written by Monsieur LAMOTH in French and done into English." Written to J. S. 1693. By a reference in p. 14, it appears to have come from the pen of the same person, who was the author of another Tract in this collection, printed in 1692, being "An accurate Examination of the Principal Texts usually alleged for the Divinity of our Saviour; and for the satisfaction by him made to the justice of God, for the sins of men; occasioned by a Book of Mr. L. Milbourn called "Mysteries (in Religion) vindicated." This piece is addressed to T. F. These initials, there can be no doubt, mean the active, philanthropic citizen, Mr. Thomas Firmin; whose character is vindicated in the preface, from the illiberal aspersions of Mr. Milbourn's pen, as a person who encouraged and patronized the printing and circulation of the Unitarian Tracts. A query suggests itself here, viz. whether the other initials may not refer to Mr. John Smith, the author of "The designed end to the Socinian Controversy," first printed in 1695, and reprinted by the London Unitarian Tract Society in 1793?

The *third* volume of the "Socinian Tracts," in the possession of the respondent, is entitled "A Third COLLECTION of TRACTS, proving the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ the only true God; and Jesus Christ the Son of God him whom the Father sanctified and sent, raised from the dead and exalted. And disproving the doctrine of Three Almighty, real subsisting Persons, Minds or Spirits; giving also an account of the *nominal* Trinity, that is, Three Modes, Subsistencies, or Somewhats in God; called by the schoolmen *Persons*; and of the judgment of the Fathers and Catholic Church for the first 150 years. Of which Tracts the following pages give the Titles." Printed in the year 1695. Which accordingly follow: the number of Tracts is eight, each marked by a distinct series of pages, and in general by peculiar titles; some of them bear the date of 1694. As *Filius Polonorum* speaks of these three volumes as in his hands, there is no occasion, on his account, to specify the titles they bear.

It will be more satisfactory to inform him that the writer of this has now before his eyes a thick quarto, lettered on the back "Socinian Tracts, Vol. 4 and 5." On opening it, offers a page with this inscription, viz. "A Fourth Collection of Tracts relating to the Doctrine of the Trinity, &c. The Titles whereof are in the next Leaf." There is no date or any other note of printing or publication. The several Tracts are distinguished by the following descriptions.

The Divine Unity once more asserted; or some Considerations tending to prove, that God is but one single Being, &c. in 24 pages. Printed in the year 1697.

Reformation in worshipping of God required, according to the means afforded of a clearer Knowledge of the Divine Will, in 8 pages.

Platonism unveiled; or an Essay concerning the Notions and Opinions of Plato, and some ancient and modern Divines, his followers; in relation to the Logos, or word in particular, and the Doctrine of the Trinity in general. In two Parts. In 139 pages. Anno Dom. 1700.

An Apology for the Parliament, representing to Mr J. Gailhard some Reasons why they did not exact sanguinary Laws, &c. In 43 pages.

Remarks on Dr. Sherlock's Sermon, of the Danger of corrupting the Faith by Philosophy. In 29 pages. Printed for Richard Baldwin, in Warwick Lane. 1697.

Mr. Emlin's Case in relation to the differences between him and some Dissenting Ministers of Dublin. In 4 pages. 1703.

Two Treatises concerning the Trinity and the Divinity of our Blessed Saviour, viz. 1, An Humble Inquiry into the Scripture Account of Jesus Christ; or a Short Argument concerning his Deity and Glory, according to the Gospel. In 22 pages. 2, An Answer thereunto, or a Resolution of the Objections against the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity. In 27 pages. 1703.

A Sober Expostulation with the Gentlemen of Mr. EMLIN's Juries at Dublin. In 8 pages.

The Excellency of Reason, demonstrated in some Short Remarks on Mr. YOUNG's two Discourses, intituled "the Wisdom of Believing." In 11 pages.

The Excellency of the Human Understanding, an Argument that the regular use of Reason is not contrary to the Veneration due to the Holy Scripture, &c. in Answer to the Censure of the Remarks on Mr. Young's two Discourses. In 25 pages. London, printed and Sold by A. Baldwin, in Warwick Lane. 1702.

The Scripturalists Christian Condescension Considered. In 8 pages.

This tract is the last in the fourth Collection. But the quarto mentioned above includes many more pieces without any general title-page to connect them with the preceding volumes. The particulars, as to subject, publication and number of pages, &c. the reader will receive in the following detail: namely,

The Moderate Trinitarian: containing a description of the Holy Trinity, both according to scripture, and approved authors of learning, and adherents to the Trinitarian Doctrine; being an Argument shewing that *Moderation* may and ought to be shewn by and to persons of different conceptions concerning some circumstances relating to the Knowledge of the Holy Trinity. Together with a short reply to *Mr. Joseph Taylor's* Brief Inquiry whether those who own and those who deny the Divinity of Christ may communicate together. By DANIEL ALLEN, London. Printed for *Mary Fabian*, at *Mercer's Chapel*, in *Cheapside*, 1699. In 46 pages.

A Letter to a Friend: with Remarks upon two Pamphlets lately published in Defence of Tritheism, viz. a Brief Enquiry, by J. T. and the Socinian Slain, by J. H. London. Printed Anno Domini, 1700. In 16 pages.

The Agreement of the Unitarians with the Catholic Church;

being a full Answer to the Infamations of *Mr. Edwards*; and the needless Exceptions of my Lords the Bishops of *Chichester*, *Worcester*, and *Sarum*, and of Monsieur *de Luzaney*. Part I. In Answer to *Mr. Edwards* and my Lord the Bishop of *Chichester*. Printed in 1697. Part II. In Answer to my Lord the Bishop of *Sarum*, Monsieur *de Luzaney*, and my Lord the Bishop of *Worcester*. In 64 pages.

The SCANDAL and FOLLY of the CROSS removed: or the Wisdom of God's Method of the Gospel, in the Death of JESUS CHRIST, manifested and justified against the Deists: London; printed for A. and J. Churchill, at the Black Swan, Paternoster-row, 1699. In 58 pages.

A Short Historical Essay, touching General Councils, Synods, Convocations, Creeds, and Imposition in Religion. By Andrew Marvel, Esq. London, Printed for E. Mallet, near Fleet Bridge, 1703. In 64 pages.

A DIALOGUE, by way of Question and Answer concerning the DEITY. All the Responses being taken verbatim out of the Scriptures. In 8 pages.

Socinianism truly Stated; being an example of fair dealing in all Theological Controversies. To which is prefixed Indifference in Disputes; recommended by a PANTHEIST, to an Orthodox Friend. London; printed in the year 1705. In 15 pages. N.B. A former proprietor of the volume has written under the title, By Mr. Toland.

A Consideration of the DAMNATORY CLAUSES in the ATHANASIAN Creed; and the several Senses they are taken in. In 9 pages.

The Consequences of the Modalist's System. In 12 pages.

A Vindication of the Worship of the Lord Jesus Christ, on the Unitarian Principles: In Answer to what is said on that Head by Mr. Joseph Boyse, in his Vindication of the Deity of Jesus Christ, 1705. In 46 pages.

Remarks on Mr. Cha. Leslie's First Dialogue on the Socinian Controversy. In 7 pages.

A Vindication of the Remarks upon Mr. Cha. Leslie's First Dialogue on the Socinian Controversy. In 8 pages.

An Examination of Mr. Leslie's Last Dialogue, Relating to the Satisfaction of Jesus Christ. Together with some Remarks on the True Reasons of Christ's Sufferings. London, printed in the year 1708. In 24 pages.

N. B. The four last were written by Mr. Thomas Emlyn.

The Indispensible Obligation of sincerely and zealously *Professing* the most Essential Truth of the Unity of God. London, printed for the Author, 1707. In 17 pages.

The SUPREME DEITY of GOD the FATHER demonstrated; being a short but Full Answer to *Dr. Sherlock's* Proofs of our Saviour's Divinity, or whatever can be urged against the Supremacy of the First Person of the Holy Trinity. London, printed in the year 1706. In 24 pages.

A Brief Vindication of the Bishop of Glocester's Discourse concerning "the Descent of the Man Christ Jesus from Heaven, &c. from the Dean of St. Paul's Charge of Heresy; with a Confutation of his New Notion in his late Book of "The Scripture Proofs of our Saviour's Divinity. London, printed in the year 1706. In 19 pages.

N. B. The two last came also from the pen of Mr. Emlyn.

An Apology for the Sentiments of the Modalists, and a Defence of the Scriptural Terms. In 8 pages.

The Naked Gospel; Discovery 1. What was the Gospel which our Lord and his Apostles preached. 2. What Additions and Alterations later ages have made in it. 3. What Advantages and Damages have thereupon ensued. Part 1. Of Faith. By a true son of the Church of England. Printed in 1690. In 102 pages.

A Short Defence of the Unitarian Faith. In 16 pages.

This is all the information which the present respondent is prepared to give to FILIUS POLONORUM. It is to be apprehended, that so long a list of publications, consisting of titles only, will not be entertaining or interesting to most readers of the Repository. But they will have the generosity to acquiesce, at least, in communications that will gratify the taste and enquiries of others, and allow that the Editor of such a work as the Monthly Repository is expected to furnish what will suit different tastes and correspond to the pursuits and studies of all his various readers, as means offer to do it. Even dry catalogues of publications may have their use, to elucidate some subject of enquiry, or to draw out more entertaining information.

I am, sir,
Yours, &c.
J. T.

Dr. Robertson's Letter to the Bishop of Ferns, Dr. Richard Robinson, who had been translated from the See of Killala to that of Ferns, in the year 1759.

To the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Ferns, Dublin.

Ravilly, Jan. 15, 1760.

MY DEAR GOOD LORD,

"Since I did myself the honour to write to you last, I have been very unwell, occasioned by a violent agitation in my mind upon a subject of the highest importance to me. But, now, that my resolution is fixed, and my mind a little settled, I find myself in some measure capable of writing to you. And, first, my Lord, suffer me to return you all the thanks that can flow from the most grateful heart, for your great goodness to me. That you should not only offer me the parishes of Tallemoy and Balliquillare; but assure me in your last letter, that you would accommodate me in the best manner you could. How then must I lament, in the second place, that I find myself incapable of receiving your lordship's favour. I beg leave to inform your lordship, that last October, a book was put into my hands, which though it had been published many years I had never seen before.

(N. B. The book was "The Free and Candid Disquisitions;" here is an hiatus in the copy from which this is transcribed; the reader will easily supply the proper words to connect the last with the following sentence:)

"With some prejudice against the avowed design. But upon considering matters seriously, I was brought over to be of the author's opinion in several particulars. So that now I find I cannot bring myself to declare an unfeigned assent and consent to all things contained in the Book of Common Prayer, &c. In debating this matter with myself, besides the arguments directly to the purpose, several strong collateral considerations came in upon the positive side of the question. The straitness of my circumstances pressed me close. A numerous family, quite unprovided for, pleaded with the most pathetic and moving eloquence. And the infirmities and wants of age, now coming fast upon me, were urged very feelingly. But one single consideration prevailed over all these. *That the Creator and Governor of the Universe, whom it is my duty to worship and adore, being the God of truth, it must be disagreeable to him to profess, subscribe and declare in any matter relating to his worship and service what is not believed to be strictly true.*

Thus, my Lord I have presumed to represent to you the state of my mind. And now I fear I must take my leave of your lordship Suffer me then to do it with assuring you, that I am with all gratitude, esteem. respect and affection,

My dear good Lord,
Your Lordship's most dutiful,
and most obedient humble servant,
W. ROBERTSON.

"I am quite at a loss what I shall say to my good Lord Primate.* If your lordship will please to make my most grateful acknowledgments to him you will oblige me much.

Religious Division of the World.

Sir,

In a Sermon by Dr. E. Calamy, entitled "Divine Mercy exalted, or Free Grace in its Glory," published in 1703, I find the following passage, p. 22.

"Some that pretend to have made an exact calculation, do observe, that if the earth, as far as it is at this day known, were divided into thirty equal parts, nineteen of them are Pagan, six Mahometan, and but five Christian."

Has there been any later calculation on this very interesting subject? I fear, on the ground of modern discoveries, a much larger proportion of the world must now be given to the Pagans.

OTIOSUS.

Difficulties in the Doctrine of a Resurrection.

Sir,

It has long appeared to me that the balance of scriptural evidence is in favour of that system which holds man to be one and indivisible, and wholly mortal—an hypothesis with which natural appearances agree. But I have been sometimes ready to lament that I have been constrained to incline to this opinion, not only as it obliges me to expect that a large portion of time, which might be filled up by happy conscious existence, will be lost in the grave, but also as it takes away from my mind the only visible means of the preservation of my consciousness for another state of being. If I die wholly, a resurrection appears scarcely within the bounds of possibility. There may be a new creation, but can the regenerated being be myself? Would not the allowance of this be an admission that any indefinite number of beings might be *myself*? If there be nothing to constitute my individuality but the will and power of the Creator, I seem reduced to the absurdity of thinking that my consciousness may be conferred upon any number of created forms.

The resurrection of Christ is scarcely the case in point that our good Unitarian divines represent it: his body was never broken up, corrupted, and dissipated. He rose, and must in the nature of things have risen, in the *same body* in which he died. Here is no difficulty. A miracle is all that is required, and the Creator can inspire the body with new life; but if the body be gone, and irrecoverably gone, and there be nothing but body, what do we mean by a resurrection? The *anastasis*, the standing up again of the same visible, conscious being, which was the apostolic doctrine, cannot surely be nothing more than a new creation.

---

* Dr. Stone,

Willingly would I believe in Dr. Watts's hypothesis (if indeed it were any thing more than a play of fancy) of an indestructible germ of matter, being the nucleus of the regenerated man, were it not altogether a gratuitous supposition to evade a difficulty. "Since," says the Dr. *(Logic*, P. i. c. 6, § 6. Observ. 5.) "*our own bodies* must rise at the last day for us *to receive rewards or punishments in them*, there may be perhaps some *original fibres* of each human body, some *stamina vitæ* or primeval *seeds of life*, which may remain unchanged through all the stages of life, death, and the grave; these may become the springs and principles of a resurrection, and sufficient to denominate it *the same body*. But," he adds, "*if there be* any such constant and vital atoms which distinguish every human body, *they are known to God only*."

Unsupported as this hypothesis is, and therefore unphilosophical as it is for a ground of argument, Dr. Priestley, if I remember right, and some of his disciples, seem willing to refer to it for the principle of individuation.

The immortality of the soul may want support from scripture, and the resurrection of the same body may involve a physical contradiction, but how, on the modern doctrine generally received by Unitarians, can we explain or understand or believe in the preservation of individual consciousness, and the resurrection of the same man?

CANTABRIGIENSIS.

Family Bible.

SIR,

I am pleased that your correspondent *A Bible Christian*, (p. 178) has turned the attention of your readers to a *Family Bible* with notes, and hope that the recommendation will be attended to. With rational notes, a judicious commentary, and practical reflections, such a work would be of inestimable value in Unitarian families: nor can it be doubted that the undertaker, if competent to the task, would meet with ample encouragement. But it is desirable that the plan of the work should be well discussed in your pages before it is entered upon; this will be a likely way to avoid the errors into which preceding commentators have fallen, and to render the publication generally acceptable. As the commencement of such discussion, I beg to solicit from your correspondents some account of the following Family Bibles, viz. *Goadby's*, in folio; the *Birmingham* Bible, in 4to, said to have been put out under the sanction of Dr. Priestley; and the *Quaker* Bible, edited, if I remember rightly, by Purves; and any others not on the Trinitarian and Calvinistic scheme. My inquiries extend to the number of volumes and editions, to the editors, to the text adopted, and its typographical correctness, to the justness of the translation, if a new one, to the plan of the commentary or notes, to the quality of these, and generally to whatever affects the value of such a work.

I am, Sir,
EPISCOPUS.

Mr. Belsham's Reply to the Rev. H. Horsley.—Letter V.

Essex House, July 3, 1813.

SIR,

The edifying particulars of the orthodox Hebrew church at Ælia, which the bishop says that he did copy, and the prebendary says that he did not copy, or at least that it was without his knowledge if the bishop did copy it, from that "very common book" of Mosheim's, the *History of the Affairs of the Christians antecedent to the Reign of Constantine,* not being very satisfactorily established by the authorities to which Mosheim refers, it became necessary to look out for other proof. The learned prelate, therefore, professedly to avoid the imputation of "relating upon Mosheim's authority what Mosheim related upon none," began himself in good earnest to dig into the mine of Christian antiquity; and passing slightly over the testimony of Epiphanius as what he well knew would not bear strict examination, and waving the testimony of Orosius, as coming too late to be of much consideration, and not altogether suiting his purpose, he fixes upon a passage in Jerome, a learned and celebrated ecclesiastical writer at the end of the fourth century, which he gravely produces as his palmary argument to establish the circumstances alleged by Mosheim and himself, concerning the origin of this far-famed orthodox Hebrew metropolitan church.

"St. Jerome," says the bishop (Remarks, Part ii. sect. 8.) "in his Commentary upon Isaiah, relates two different expositions of the prophecy concerning Zabulon and Naphtbali, delivered in the beginning of the ninth chapter; of which expositions he ascribes the one to the *Hebrews believing in Christ*, the other to the Nazarenes. The character given of these Hebrews, that they believed in Christ, without any thing to distinguish their belief from the common belief of the church, without any note of error or imperfection, is a plain character of complete orthodoxy; for it was neither the disposition of St. Jerome, nor the fashion of his age to miss any opportunity of proclaiming the vices of those who were deemed heretics."

To a plain reader not familiar with logical subtilties, nor deeply read in ecclesiastical lore, it would not be very easy to trace out the history of the church at Ælia from these few words of Jerome, but the bishop, who was a master of the dialectic art, and by no means deficient in the useful talent of *helping out a broken story*, has cleared up the account to the entire satisfaction of all who are willing to yield implicit credit to episcopal authority. And as his argument lies in narrow compass, and is worthy of being recorded as a curious specimen of what learning and logic united are able to accomplish, the several steps of his demonstration shall be set down in his own words, (see Tracts, p. 409). He begins with a few necessary postulates, "I TAKE FOR GRANTED these things."

1. "A church of Hebrew Christians adhering to the observance of the Mosiac law, subsisted for a time at Jerusalem, and for some time at Pella, from the beginning of Christianity until the final dispersion of the Jews by Adrian."

2. "Upon this event a Christian church arose at Ælia."

3. "The church at Ælia often, but improperly, called the church of Jerusalem, for Jerusalem was no more, in its external form, in its doctrines and its discipline a Greek church: and it was governed by bishops of the uncircumcision. Again I TAKE FOR GRANTED"—

4. "That the observation of the Mosaic law to the primitive church at Jerusalem, was a matter of mere habit and national prejudice, not of conscience.—St. Paul, in all his Epistles maintains the total insignificance of the Mosaic law, either for Jew or Gentile, after Christ had made the great atonement: and the notion that Paul could be mistaken in a point which is the principal subject of a great part of his writings, is an impiety which I cannot impute to our holy brethren, the saints of the primitive church of Jerusalem. Again, I TAKE FOR GRANTED"

5. "That with good Christians, such as I believe the Christians of the primitive church of Jerusalem to have been, motives of worldly interest, which would not overcome conscience, would, nevertheless overcome mere habit."

6. "That the desire of partaking in the privileges of the Ælian colony, from which Jews were excluded, would accordingly be a motive, that would prevail with the Hebrew Christians of Jerusalem and other parts of Palestine, to divest themselves of the form of Judaism, by laying aside their antient customs."

And now to bring all these ingenious assumptions to bear upon the point in question, and to establish the existence and origin of his favourite church, the learned prelate, waxing bolder as he advances, adds, with a tone of confidence, p. 419, "I AFFIRM

7. "That a body of orthodox Christians, of the Hebrews, were actually existing in the world *much later* than in the time of Adrian."

To establish this fact the bishop cites the before-mentioned passage from Jerome. A very doubtful argument certainly, as Dr. Priestley has distinctly shewn. But that we may not appear to cavil, let this be added likewise to the string of concessions. Let it be further *taken for granted*, that the simple expression in the writings of Jerome, concerning *Hebrews believing in Christ*, alone and unsupported, proves the existence of an orthodox Hebrew church, in the fourth or fifth century; the question still recurs, how does the existence of a body of orthodox Hebrew Christians, nobody can tell where, in the age of Jerome, prove that the Hebrew Christians in the second century, in the reign of Adrian, discarded at once all their early prejudices, and habits of attachment to the Mosaic ritual, and placed themselves under a Gentile bishop, in order to secure the privileges of the Ælian colony? But for this difficulty, great as it is, and insurmountable as it would be in inferior hands, the consummate dialectics of the right reverend prelate, have provided a solution no less satisfactory than uncommon. "If," says the bishop, (Tracts, p. 421,) "the orthodox Christians of the Hebrews, actually existing *somewhere in the world*, from the reign of Adrian to the days of Jerome, were not members of the church of Ælia, dwelling at Ælia, and in the adjacent parts of Palestine, Dr. PRIESTLEY, IF HE BE SO PLEASED, MAY SEEK THEIR SETTLEMENT." q. e. d.

Whether this argument, so clear, concise and conclusive, be borrowed from the Baconian or Aristotelian school, it may not be easy for those who are uninitiated in the mysteries of the dialectic art, distinctly to develope. One fact is certain: it is an argument which admits of no reply.

The calm inquirer in his review of the controversy, concludes his summary of this extraordinary process of reasoning with the following remark, p. 432, of the truth and justice of which the reader having the evidence now before him, is competent to judge.

"The whole fabric of this famous church of orthodox Christians at Ælia, who abandoned at once the institutions of Moses, in order to enjoy the privileges of the Ælian colony, rests solely upon the testimony of Jerome, more than two hundred and fifty years afterward, to this single fact, that in his time there were 'Hebrews who believed in Christ.' And by the learned writer's own frank and liberal confession, all the rest is TAKEN FOR GRANTED."

Upon this plain and undeniable statement of facts, the reverend prebendary is pleased to make the following *temperate* and *judicious* strictures. Tracts, p. 581.

"The *perversion* of the sense of the bishop's words, in some part of his disquisitions on this subject, by Mr. Belsham, who *represents him as taking every thing for granted*, because he occasionally makes use of that phrase, where there is no room for difference of opinion, is *scandalous*, because it must have been *wilful*. It can deceive no man, however, who will take the trouble to have recourse to the bishop's Tracts, in order to discover what he really took for granted; though the humble Unitarians, who place implicit confidence in Mr. B. may take it for granted, on his report, that the editor of the works of Newton knew nothing of the laws of reasoning, or of demonstration."

The reverend gentleman is much mistaken in his judgment of the Unitarians, if he supposes that they are so humble as to submit to be drilled into the belief of any articles of human device; or into implicit subjection to any human authority. They glory in that great Protestant principle, the right of private judgment: and in the liberty with which Christ has made them free, they are determined to stand fast.

The reverend prebendary has thought fit to express his accusation in general and sweeping terms, and with great prudence he has declined to produce the *scandalous* passages. Nor did he wish any of his friends to take that trouble for him. He certainly had no desire to be confronted with his adversary. He expected no doubt to be believed upon his sacerdotal word. But that age is past. At the bar of an enlightened public the priest and the layman stand upon equal ground; nor can the gown, nor even the mitre give currency to a faulty argument, or save gross misrepresentation from deserved contempt. The whole of the case now lies before the public. It requires no comment. The intelligent and candid reader cannot fail to discern to which of the parties the epithet of *scandalous* *and wilful perversion* properly applies. To the verdict of such judges I most willingly appeal, and am,

Sir,
Yours, &c.
T. BELSHAM.

Postscript.—As truth is the only object in view with the writer of these letters, it is the furthest from his wish to take an ungenerous advantage of any inadvertency of language, to charge an opponent with principles which he would disavow. The author certainly understood the bishop as explicitly approving of what logicians call the *argumentum ad ignorantiam*, or assuming and arguing from principles known to be false, provided the opponent is too ignorant to detect the untruth: and he strongly expressed the indignation which he felt, and which he trusts he shall ever feel against such a mode of reasoning. The following are his lordship's words, Tracts, p. 173.

"I shall take what you may think a bold step. I shall tax the veracity of your witness,—of this Origen. He alleges of the Hebrew Christians, in general, that they had not renounced the Mosaic law. The assertion served him for an answer to the invective which Celsus had put in the mouth of a Jew, against the converted Jews, as deserters of the laws and customs of their ancestors. *The answer was not the worse for wanting truth, if his heathen antagonist was not sufficiently informed in the true distinctions of Christian sects to detect the falsehood.* But in all the time which he spent in Palestine, had Origen never conversed with Hebrew Christians of another sort?"

It never entered into the author's conception, and probably never would, that the bishop in this passage is not expressing his own sentiments, but those of Origen. But he finds that some very intelligent and impartial persons see the case in a different light. A correspondent, to whose judgment he pays great deference, expresses himself in the following language:—"May I suggest to you, that the passage about Origen, which you animadvert upon in your last letter in the Repository, from Dr. Horsley, does not seriously mean to approve of his using a groundless argument, provided his heathen adversary could not detect a fallacy, but that *such a man as Origen* would think it not the worse for wanting truth. This makes a material alteration, so far as Dr. Horsley's character is concerned; and it seems to me to be the only sense the words will bear."

The reader having the passage before him, will judge which of the two senses is most natural and obvious. The expression is, at least, ambiguous: and it would have been very easy for the learned prelate to have fixed the sense by inserting the words, *in Origen's estimation*, or some equivalent phrase. Considering therefore the ambiguity of the phraseology, the author hopes that he shall be acquitted of the charge of intentional misrepresentation. Many will, no doubt, understand the expressions in the same sense with the author's correspondent. And the author himself is willing to believe that he has misconceived the bishop's meaning: and upon this ground, should the letters be reprinted, he will alter what he has written upon that subject. His design is not to detract from any man's character: nor does his cause require it. It needs no misrepresentation to shew how the bishop exerts all the energies of his mighty mind, all his powers of learning, of reasoning and of language, to extricate himself from the fatal embarrassment into which he is plunged, by placing too great confidence in the reveries of Mosheim: and how all these energies are exerted in vain, and he is obliged in the end to withdraw from the field, baffled, defeated and silenced. Nor is any thing requisite but a simple detail of facts, to expose the temerity of the worthy prebendary, who knowing little either of the scope or of the state of the controversy, runs *a muck* at all he meets, and in his pious zeal to protect his venerable father, sometimes jostles him and knocks him down, and at other times heroically encounters windmills for giants, sometimes exciting compassion and sometimes derision: but never doing harm to any one but himself.

Mr. Platts's Complaint of Evangelical Magazine.

Boston, July 8, 1813.

SIR,

A few weeks since I published a pamphlet, entiled *Reflections on Materialism, Immaterialism, an Intermediate State, the Sleep of the Soul, and the Resurrection of the Body, being an Attempt to Prove that the Resurrection commences at Death.* If any light could possibly be thrown upon a subject so intricate, and at the same time so important as the doctrine of a future state confessedly is to all mankind, I conceived it might be useful to the pilgrims who are travelling to a "better country," of every name and of every denomination; for, however Christians may differ in other respects, they all agree in the belief of a future life. Under these impressions, I sent an advertisement of my book to be inserted on the wrapper of the Evangelical Magazine, when, behold, they refused to insert it, and on my application for an explanation they also refused to assign the reason of their conduct. I mean not to make any harsh remarks on the partial and uncandid conduct of these self-named evangelical Christians, I merely state the *fact*, and leave every one to draw what inferences he pleases from the case.

My book was not intended to give offence to any serious Christian: it is the result of much reflection; and, whatever may be thought of the opinions it contains, I trust it is written in that spirit of humility and charity which will never be a disgrace to a sincere enquirer after truth.

Yours, &c.

JOHN PLATTS.

A Quere.

SIR, *June* 15*th*, 1813.

If in some darker day, a sect were to arise, which instead of addressing prayer in the only scriptural mode, should, in various parts of their liturgy, however otherwise unexceptionable, worship God, not through Jesus Christ, or in his name, but through or in the name of the Humanity, or the holy, blessed and glorious Humanity,—would the plea, think you, of *necessitas rei, major cantela*, or any other, acquit such a sect, in the opinion even of an orthodox fellow Christian, of a wanton, perverse and perilous deviation from the better, as well as more legitimate, phraseology of the Bible?

Your's
TE TACE.

GLEANINGS; OR, SELECTIONS AND REFLECTIONS MADE IN A COURSE OF GENERAL READING.

No. CXXX.

"*Much good do you.*"

Under the above not very dignified title, the quaint *Fuller* has the following *thought*, in his *good Thoughts for Worse Times*, the Sequel to his *Good Thoughts for Bad Times*, 24mo. 1649. pp. 60, 61.

"One Niceas a Philosopher having his shoes stolen from him, *May they* (said he) *fit his feet that took them away.* A wish at the first view very harmless, but there was that in it, which poyson'd his charity into a malicious revenge, for he himself had *hurl'd* or *crooked feet*, so that in effect, he wished the thief to be lame.

"Whosoever hath plundered me of my *books* and *papers*, I freely forgive him, and desire that he may fully understand and make good use thereof, wishing him more joy of them than he hath right to them. Nor is there any *snake* under my *herbs*, nor have I (as *Niceas*) any reservation or latent *sense*, to myself, but from my heart do desire, that to all purposes and intents, my *books* may be beneficial unto him. Onely requesting him, that one passage in his (lately my) *Bible* [namely Eph. iv. 28.] may be taken into his serious consideration."

No. CXXXI.

Fides Carbonaria.

Implicit faith has been sometimes ludicrously styled *fides carbonaria, the Collier's faith*, from the noted story of one who examining an ignorant collier on his religious principles, asked him what it was that he believed. He answered, "I believe what the church believes." The other rejoined, "What then does the church believe?" He replied readily, "The church believes what I believe." The other desirous, if possible, to bring him to particulars, once more resumes his inquiry; "Tell me then, I pray you, what it is which you and the church both believe?" The only answer the collier could give, was, "Why truly, Sir, the church and I both—believe the same thing!"

No. CXXXII.

Antinomianism.

Antinomianism, said Robert Robinson, at a time when he was not at the furthest remove from it, is a sort of *surfeit*, which in all churches has been found to succeed a plenty of *evangelical preaching*.

No. CXXXIV.

Head of a Faction.

Whosoever makes himself the head of a faction, says the historian of Henry II. must consider abilities more than morals, and reward zeal for the cause, which is frequently strongest in those who have no other merit, with the most distinguished marks of favour.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

Additional[*] *Contributions to Scriptural Criticism.*

June 3*d*, 1813.

Μὴ γεμέσα βαιοῖσι.

2 Kings, xvi. 9.—" the king of Assyria [Tiglath Pileser] *hearkened unto him:* for the king of Assyria went up against Damascus, and took it, &c." 2 Chron. xxviii. 20, 21.—" Tiglath Pileser, king of Assyria, came unto him, and *distressed him*, but *strengthened him not*."

These two accounts of the issue of the alliance between Ahaz and the king of Assyria, seem to contradict each other. The aid of some of the correspondents to the Monthly Repository, is invited, for the solution of the difficulty. In the mean time, I conjecture that the real state of the case might be as follows:

Ahaz applied, for help against his enemies, to Tiglath Pileser, whom he engaged, by costly presents, taken partly out of the sacred treasures, in his defence. The assistance[†] was, no doubt, seasonable and welcome: yet the sum paid for it, was perhaps excessive. Supposing this to have been the fact, Ahaz might, *on the whole*, and *eventually*, be more injured than profited by his connexion with the Assyrian monarch.

Psalm i. 3.—" whatsoever he doeth, shall prosper."

According to the version proposed in the margin of an interleaved Bible of a late learned and ingenious friend, " it shall bring to maturity whatsoever it beareth." By means of this rendering, (and it has the sanction of Buchanan, Geddes, &c.), the image is continued and preserved. On the other hand, there are not wanting great authorities for the present translation, in defence of which, moreover, it is alleged that the clause " it shall bring forth its fruit in its season," makes the last member of the third verse—considering it as part of the metaphor, of the description of the *thing* and not of the *person*,—superfluous. But, in truth, this representation is first general and then particular. The psalmist begins with suggesting a comparison:

> " He [the good man] shall be like a tree
> planted by the rivers of water,
> That bringeth forth its fruit in its season;"

he next places in full view the most striking circumstance of the similitude—

> " And its leaf shall not fade,
> But it shall bring to maturity whatsoever it beareth" [both leaves and fruit].

In the case of many if not of most trees the maturity of the fruit depends on the healthy condition of the leaf: and that the original word, in the Hebrew Bible and in the Greek of the LXX and of the New Testament, sometimes requires the sense of *bear*, instead of *do*, will appear from Gen. xli 7. Isaiah v. 10, Habb. iii. 17, and John xv. 5.

---

[*] Mon. Rep. vol. vii. 696—701.

[†] That it was not withholden, we learn from Josephus Antiq. Jud. ix. 12, § 3, and thus much may, probably, be inferred from Isaiah, vii. 1—17.

doubt, that in the Alexandrian church, young women sang in public worship, accompanying their voices with instrumental music. But Clemens has spoken of *musical instruments as being fitter for beasts than men.** The passage must be considered somewhat at large. It is in his Pædagogus, lib. ii. c. 4, where he treats of the conduct proper at social meetings. After reprehending the dissolute manners of the profligate at their banquetings, and their riotous music and dancing, and quoting the apostle's words, Rom. xiii. 12, 13, he goes on, "Let the *pipe* then be given to the shepherd, and the *flute* to the superstitious idolater; for truly *these instruments*, more fit for beasts than men, ought to be banished from the sober entertainment."† He then goes on to mention some singular uses to which these particular instruments had been applied, and which had probably contributed to his dislike of them; and censures that kind of music which excites to intemperance and disorder. He next proceeds to explain the instrumental music mentioned in the Psalms, of the organs of the body, and the body itself; but I do not perceive that he means to intimate that those instruments were not employed; but simply that the spirit of the directions given respecting them may be fulfilled without them. "Man (he goes on) is a peaceful instrument: but if a person examine attentively, he will find other instruments to be warlike, inflaming the mind to eager desires, or inkindling love, or rendering the passions furious." He then speaks of the various instruments employed in war by different nations, and says, "We employ then one instrument, the peaceful Word alone, with which we honour God; and no longer use the ancient psaltery, and trumpet, and timbrels, and flute, employed among warlike people," &c. He soon after adduces the apostle's words in Col. iii. 16, 17, and adds, "This is our grateful festivity; *and if you choose to sing and play upon the harp or the lyre, you will incur no censure*;‡ you will imitate the pious Hebrew king, who was well-pleasing to God." After quoting Ps. xxxiii. 1, 2, (the decachord mentioned in which he seems to consider as a type of Christ) he says, "as we ought to praise the Maker of all before we partake of food, so when drinking we ought to make harmony (ψαλλειν) in his praise." He recommends thanksgiving before sleep overtakes us; and again makes a reference to the Psalms.

---

word did take place before the time of Hesychius, (See p 45 of this volume.) It had not however in the time of Aulus Gellius.

* Pierce's Vindication of the Dissenters, Part III. Ch. 3. This great and good man has not always treated his antagonist with perfect candour. In the chapter just referred to, which I believe constitutes his Tractate on Church Music, he quotes Clem. Alex. as against instrumental music in toto, when in the same chapter that Father expresses himself at least without censure of instrumental music with the hymns of devotion

† The Athenians in the time of Plato prohibited all kinds of wind instruments, because they changed the lineaments of the countenance, and were also injurious to the organs of respiration.

‡ Κᾳν προς κιθαραν εθελῃσης η λυραν ᾳδειν τε και ψαλλειν μωμος ουκ εστιν.

He next gives an account of the customs of the ancient Greeks at their banquets, in which they sang the scolion, a song like the Hebrew Psalms, "and those of them who are most skilled in music, sang also to the lyre." He then proceeds to direct that no love-songs should be employed, but that their songs should be the praises of God. He refers to Ps. cxlix. 3, 1; expresses his approbation of chastened, temperate harmony; and admonishes to avoid all that has a contrary tendency.

The foregoing abstract, if it do not afford the readers any instruction or amusement, may assist to convince him that this ancient writer has been too hastily pressed to give evidence against the use of instrumental music among the early Christians.

[To be continued.]

Mr. John Jones on the Observations on Mr. Wakefield's Translation of Acts xx. 28.

I regret exceedingly the harsh and ungenerous remarks that have appeared in your last Repository, (p. 392—397) on Mr. Wakefield. Whether we consider the virtues, the talents, or the learning of this excellent man, we cannot but feel regret, gratitude, and admiration; and it little becomes a friend of genuine Christianity and literature, as I conceive *Primitivus* to be, to throw insults over a grave which every feeling and candid mind should approach with a wreath of praise. The best defence of Gilbert Wakefield's critical talents will be a refutation of Griesbach: Primitivus's severity will then fall upon himself and his oracle.

The common text in question is *Ποιμαινειν την εκκλησιαν του ϑεου, ἡν περιεποιεσατο δια του ἰδιου αἱματος*, Acts xx. 28. For *του ϑεου* Griesbach has introduced into his text *του κυριου*. The authority of manuscripts is decidedly in favour of the common text. For some support that text, and, moreover, *forty-seven* read *κυριου και ϑεου*; and these, in effect, support the genuineness of *ϑεου*, and are *against* the referring of *κυριου* to *Christ*. The Arabic and Æthiopic versions confirm the common text; yet Griesbach says, *Æthiops habet vocabulum, quo semper utitur sive ϑεος in Græca veritate legatur, sive κυριος Neutri igitur lectioni, si solus spectetur, favet.* This is really as Wakefield observes *infamously false;* though I could wish that a more temperate language had been used by him. The Æthiopic translator associated with *ϑεος* the same awful or even superstitious idea which the Septuagint had done with the term *Jehovah*: he therefore seems to render *ϑεος* by *κυριος* wherever it occurs: and by that word when used absolutely or unrestricted he ever means the Supreme Being. Mr. Wakefield knew this to be a fact, and he asserts it; though the assertion, it must be allowed, is weakened by the appeal which he makes to his own recollection. The Latin version of the Æthiopic stands thus, in *Walton's Polyglott*, *Attendite totum gregem, cui præposuit vos spiritus sanctus, episcopos, ut pascatis domum Christianam Dei*, &c. The reader after this will judge, whether Griesbach or Wakefield is to be depended upon;

and Primitivus, who, I suspect, has more ability than candour, on revising his article, will, nevertheless, reflect upon some parts of it with regret.

There are two reasons which, with the predominant authority of manuscripts, must determine us with full confidence against Griesbach. The expression *ἣ εκκλησια του κυριου* never occurs in the New Testament: and if it did occur, it would not mean the *church of Christ*, but *the church of God;* because *ὁ κυριος*, when used in the Jewish and Christian scriptures, unrestricted by some other word or circumstances in the context, ever denotes the Supreme Being. Griesbach, therefore, has introduced a change of words, without any change whatever in the meaning, which shews him either unacquainted with Greek, or destitute of judgment.

On the other hand, the common text, *την εκκλησιαν του θεου*, is demonstrably the true reading. The term *εκκλεσια* means an assembly or collection of men; and the apostle here uses the phrase *την εκκλησιαν του θεου*, to distinguish the true believers, as a body of people who received the doctrine of God, and who were devoted to God, by superior virtue, in opposition to the Gnostic teachers, who embraced cunningly devised fables, and who did *not*, on account of their vices, belong to the church of God. "I know this," says he, "that after my departure, grievous wolves will enter in among you, not sparing the flock—speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." The church of God is the same with that which Peter calls the *flock of God*, 1 Pet. v. 2. And it is observable that Paul uses it *eleven times* in the course of his epistles, not to mention that, with the same view, he has in the context, the phrases "kingdom of God, the gospel of God," and "the counsel of God."

But how are we to understand the passage? Not, assuredly, with Mr. Wakefield. Had the expression occurred in a heathen writer, "the blood of God," might be intended to mean "the Son of God." But the apostle, who was a Jew, and, as such, accustomed to consider God as a pure spiritual Being, would have thought a language of this kind, not only improper but profane: and I am sorry that Mr. W. through his great partiality for the heathen authors should have been betrayed into such an interpretation. On the other hand, the commonly understood construction stands opposed, not only to reason, but to the practice of writers in Greek and other languages, "To feed the church of God, which he secured with his blood." *Του θεου* is introduced obliquely, to limit the general term *εκκλησιαν*, and is to be supplied in the succeeding clause,—*ἥν* i. e. *ἥν εκκλησιαν του θεου*. Now this last is the object of *περιεποιεσατο*; but a clause introduced to define the object, cannot be separated from it, and changed, to become the agent to the same verb. This would be a mode of writing, to which nothing, I believe, similar can be found in any author, ancient or modern. Had Paul intended this meaning, he would have written to this effect, *ποιμαινειν την εκκλησιαν ἥν περιεποιεσατο ὁ θεος δια του ἱδιου ἁιματος*. Who then is the person that we are to understand by *he?* In speaking and in composition, it is not unusual with all men to omit *the agent*, or principal subject of discourse. if it be notorious who that subject is; or if the frequent recurrence of his name cannot fail to recal the idea of him, even in circumstances where he is only alluded to. Thus the Pythagoreans said and wrote, *αυτος εφα*, *ipse dixit*. It was not necessary on any occasion, to say that *αυτος*, *he*, meant Pythagoras. The writer, the subject of the discourse, the constant reference made to him by his disciples, were sufficient to answer this purpose. In the same manner, it was a notorious fact, that Jesus had shed his blood for the benefit of mankind: and the apostles were constantly speaking of the generous sacrifice which he had made of himself, in this respect. On the notoriety of this fact, as sufficient to explain his meaning, the apostle depended, when, following the rapidity of his ideas, without any suspicion of grammatical inaccuracy, he said, "feed the church of God, which *he*—he who, as we all know, died on the cross,—fenced with his blood." We may see a similar instance of this omission, on this very subject, in Micah v. 2. and it is observable, that for *he* of the prophet, is introduced the term *governor*, in Matt. ii. 6.

The various reading on this text, is easily accounted for. When the true construction was overlooked, the impropriety of the implied phrase, *ἀιμα του ϑεου*, to which there is nothing similar in the N. T. was necessarily felt; and even the advocates of the Divinity of Jesus, like Griesbach, in modern days, naturally looked out for a more rational and probable expression. The note of Griesbach, which has been deemed so learned and satisfactory, is certainly one of the most elaborate in his work; but it only proves that he had more candour than judgment. In my humble opinion, notwithstanding the high praise it is now the fashion to heap upon this critic, his reputation has far exceeded his real merit; and I will engage to shew, that in the far greater number of those places in which he has mostly laboured to correct the Greek text, he has, as in this passage, been successful only in corrupting it.

JOHN JONES.

INTELLIGENCE.

Unitarian Fund.

In resuming the account of the Anniversary of the Unitarian Fund we feel great pleasure in stating that we are enabled, by the assistance of some gentlemen who took notes of what passed, to present our readers with the substance of the speeches on the occasion.

We have already stated that upwards of Three Hundred gentlemen were assembled at the Dinner, and that W. Frend, Esq. was in the chair. To that gentleman, the company and the Society are under great obligations, for the able and dignified manner in which he presided at their festival. Almost all the sentiments and names, announced from the chair, were prefaced by remarks, tending to make them welcome to the meeting, and the spirit and harmony of the company were kept up to the last.

We shall notice only the Toasts which led to the speeches, with which, in the manner before stated, we have been favoured.

"The Rev. E. Butcher."

Mr. Butcher began by saying, that he was almost equally afraid that he should not be able to make himself heard by so numerous an assembly; or to express, to his own satisfaction, the gratitude he felt at the very handsome terms in which his services had been mentioned by the Chairman, or the candour and attention with which they had been listened to by many whom he was then addressing:—he said, that if his feeble efforts should prove successful in promoting what the worthy Chairman had justly and emphatically styled "vital religion," he should indeed deem himself honoured and happy. He congratulated the company upon the gradual extension of what appeared to them to be *just* and *scriptural* views of the Divine Being, the *sole* object of religious worship, and of the paternal, wise, and beneficent nature of his government. He rejoiced that his station in life was one which led him to the investigation of religious *truth* for himself, and to the diffusion of it amongst his fellow travellers through this preparatory state. He reminded them that it was a most interesting and noble cause in which they were engaged, that if they pursued it in a steady and honourable manner, it must, by the divine blessing, be ultimately successful. He besought them not to injure this *good* cause, by any unworthy and immoral conduct; and concluded a speech, which was heard throughout with profound attention, and repeated marks of applause. in words to this effect: "Finally, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, may your whole behaviour both in public and private life do honour to your religious profession, whether you belong to the comparatively higher or lower classes of society: whether you are engaged in any of the useful and honourable arts which contribute so essentially to the comfort of mankind, or are treading the sometimes intricate, and sometimes luminous paths of science; whether your progress hitherto has been more or less successful, may you still be pressing towards perfection: may prosperity of the best sort be your portion: may you reach the *nobility* of virtue, the *peace* of a pure conscience, and the *favour* of heaven."

"The Rev. J. Joyce, and Prosperity to the Unitarian Book Societies."

Mr. Joyce briefly related the history of the establishment of the Book Society. He stated that of the 30 members who first associated to frame the institution (now upwards of 20 years ago) 10 were still living, of whom he was one. The Society had distributed books of the value of £5000. He, as Secretary, of the Society, invited persons in want of Tracts, to make known their wants; and he concluded, with expressing his hope that as there had always been, there would always be, cordial co-operation between the Book Society and the Fund.

"Mr. Wm. Smith, and the Speedy Repeal of all Penal Statutes in Matters of Religion."

Mr. Edward Taylor said, that as one of Mr. Wm. Smith's constituents he rose to thank the company for the tribute of respect which they had paid to that gentleman. Mr. Smith had recommended himself to the electors of Norwich, by his constant and steady adherence to the principles of civil and religious liberty, which principles, as long he continued to advocate, he would receive the support of his present constituents. With regard to the Bill, about to be introduced into parliament by Mr. Smith, Mr. T. said it had his entire approbation; if it passed, he should consider it as one stone removed from that horrid and unsightly building which superstition and persecution had erected, and which he trusted would, as just and liberal views of religion increased, be razed to the ground. He thought the fate of the Bill more doubtful in the House of Lords than in the House of Commons, but even in the bench of Bishops he expected it would not want a supporter. He doubted not but the venerable and excellent bishop of that diocese in which he resided, would manifest the same truly catholic and christian spirit which had inspired him in the support of the Catholic cause. He took that opportunity of bearing his testimony to the amiable and benevolent character of the Bishop of Norwich, a man whose private and public virtues were worthy the imitation of Christians of all classes, but more especially of those who were elevated to stations of power and influence in the church.

"The Missionaries."

Mr. Wright said, "I think it an honour to stand connected with the Unitarian Fund, on account of the liberal principles on which it is founded, the important objects it is designed to promote, and the respectability and worth of its numerous supporters. To be employed as one of its Missionaries, in enlightening and liberalizing mankind, I deem a peculiar happiness. May I be permitted, Sir, just to mention what your Missionaries endeavour to effect by their exertions? It is their endeavour to bring men to use their reason in all matters of religion, to receive the gospel in its native simplicity, to lead them to right views of God, and to love Jesus Christ without thinking ill of his Father, to promote knowledge virtue and charity. Since our last annual meeting I have travelled 3200 miles, and preached in nearly an hundred different places, half of them places in which I had not preached before. With the greatest satisfaction have I witnessed the progress Unitarianism is making and the growing zeal of its friends in various parts of the country, especially in the North west, in Norwich, and some other places. I have sometimes been thought too sanguine in my expectations of the success which would attend our exertions; but, Sir, that success has been greater than I had dared to hope I should witness in so short a time. Could I communicate to this company the pleasure I have derived from what I have seen and heard, in the course of my Missionary labours since our last anniversary, I should not fear tiring them by a long speech; but that is not possible. After what has been done, from the present promising appearances, and from the numerous friends of the cause in various parts of the country, what may we not hope to see effected? If there were no Unitarians in the kingdom but the present company I should not fear for the cause; they would be sufficient to make way for the truth to go forth, and let it but have room to spread and operate and it will not fail to be successful and to triumph. Sir, I sincerely thank you and the present very respectable company, for so kindly noticing the Missionaries in drinking their health, and fervently wish you all may enjoy health and every kind of prosperity."

Mr. Bennett also said, "I rise to express my gratification at having my health drank by a company like this, so numerous, so respectable for wealth, knowledge, and above all for virtue. It is impossible but that I must most gratefully feel the honour which has now been conferred upon me. I have had the pleasure, Sir, of being connected with this Society from the time of its formation; I have marked its utility, I have rejoiced in its success; and nothing has happened in the whole course of my life which has given me greater pleasure than my being a member of the Unitarian Fund, and being allowed, in my humble way, to contribute to the furtherance of its great objects. I esteem it an honour to belong to this Society because of the principles on which it is formed. It is a religious Society which recognises the God of Creation as the Father of all mankind; and as the offspring of one God, it considers all men as having a common capacity susceptible of improvement in knowledge and virtue. In this we make no difference between the rich and the poor; here they meet together, and it is acknowledged, that the Lord is the Maker of them all. I esteem it an honour, Sir, to belong to this Society, because it acts upon the principles I have now mentioned. It endeavours to instruct the common people in the knowledge of religion, and to teach them to know the One God, and Jesus Christ whom he has sent. The effort is worthy of those who are already informed; for if the poor are instructed in knowledge and virtue, they must necessarily be greatly benefited; and, indeed, every thing about their situation of a dishonourable nature, is removed. The members of this Society, in the important object of their pursuit, seem to be looking at the example of their great Master, who went about doing good; and whose ministry was very much directed to those of humble circumstances. To the poor, said he, the gospel is preached. I esteem it an honour, Sir, to belong to this Society because its individual members employ part of their wealth for the prosecution of a grand design. How much money is spent in procuring the luxuries and pleasures which this transitory world affords. I would by no means depreciate the blessings of this life; the bounties of Divine Providence are not to be despised; if gratefully possessed and temperately used, they are real enjoyments, and constituent parts of human happiness. But still the pursuit of temporal pleasure, though innocent in its nature, is not comparable to the instruction of mankind in the religion of Jesus Christ, which is emphatically called, The glorious Gospel of the Blessed God. By this you increase the present happiness of your fellow creatures, and lay the foundation for their eternal felicity.

I conclude, Sir, with expressing my cordial approbation of the design of this Society, and with hoping, that I shall ever continue to deserve its approbation. As far as my other engagements will permit, my humble services are at its disposal. May health and prosperity attend each individual of this company; and may every laudable and virtuous effort be crowned with success."

"Mr. Alderman Wood, and the Progress of Education amongst the Poor."

The worthy Alderman expressed himself both pleased and surprised to find so large a company assembled on such an occasion. He was flattered with having his name connected with Education. The Lancasterian School in the City for 1000 children, with which he had to do, already contained 800. He was pleased to find and to report that the Catholics were eager to get their children into the School, owing to the liberal plan on which it was established; no particular creed being laid down or suffered to be inculcated.

The objects of the Society had the alderman's approbation, and he thought that nothing more than zeal was wanted to realise them. He considered the zeal of the Methodists worthy of imitation by Unitarian Christians. He mentioned an instance, coming under his own knowledge, of a mine being to be opened in the West, which had drawn together 3 or 400 people, who, being principally Methodists, had no sooner assembled, than they raised a decent meeting house.

"Mr. Alderman Goodbehere, and the Cause of Truth and Freedom in the City of London."

In return, the worthy magistrate expressed his satisfaction in being in such a company, his regret at not having been earlier introduced into the Society, and his wish for further acquaintance.

The Alderman dwelt for some time upon the pending Trinity Bill, to which he wished success, but the success of which he dared scarcely anticipate. He recommended that if opposition should arise in the House of Lords the Unitarians should pray to be heard by counsel; which would oblige the opposers to give their reasons.

"The Treasurer."

Mr. Christie, on his health being drank as treasurer, returned thanks for the honour that had been done him, in having any service he had rendered the society so kindly accepted and so liberally acknowledged.—He expressed the satisfaction he had received in discharging the duties of his office, and in an especial manner from the opportunity he had of witnessing the harmonic co-operation of the Committee, which to him was

Matt. x. 10,—"the workman is worthy of his meat,"

Luke x. 7,—"the labourer is worthy of his hire,"

1 Tim. v. 18. "For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn: and, *The labourer is worthy of his reward.*"

It has been concluded from the manner in which this quotation is made by Paul, and from the occurrence of the words in Matthew and Luke, that the gospels of those evangelists were extant when the Apostle wrote to his beloved convert. However, there is no decisive proof of the sentence being introduced as a citation from any sacred books; and the probability is that it formed one of those current maxims of the age and country of which the writers of the New Testament sometimes availed themselves. Lardner has taken no notice of this text in that section* of his *Supplement*, &c. where his object is to shew *that the Gospels are not mentioned, nor referred to, in the Epistles, &c.*

Matt. x. 8,—"Freely ye have received, freely give."

It was highly proper, says Mr. Cappe, when commenting on this verse,† *that the apostles should shew their disinterestedness, in opposition to the Jewish teachers, who "devoured widows' houses."* The remark is just, considered in itself, but can scarcely be admitted as an explanation of the precept of our Lord's now before us. We have already seen that he pronounces "the workman worthy of his meat:" and it appears to have been his design that his twelve disciples should accept, as some return for their labours, the hospitality and good offices of their friends. The words must therefore be read with a single reference of them to the preceding clauses: "Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out dæmons; freely ye have received, freely give."—q. d. *Miraculous powers have been largely and without grudging bestowed on you; and hence you come under an obligation to employ them liberally and unreluctantly in the relief of human misery.*

Matt. x. 34. "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword."

Mr. Gibbon* has thought fit to style this "an ambiguous text:" there will be no difficulty in vindicating it from the charge.

The two clauses of the verse ought to be compared with each other: the declaration in the former is simply, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth;" and this is explained by the remaining sentence, "I came not to send peace but a sword." War is undoubtedly one of those states of things which are exactly the reverse of peace; still, it is not the only one. Peace is public or private, national or domestic: and the opposite of private tranquillity, is *division.* In scriptural phraseology, moreover, a sword is spoken of as an emblem and instrument sometimes of division (1 Kings, iii. 24, 2 Sam. xii. 10, Luke ii. 35), sometimes of civil justice (Acts xii. 2. Rom. xiii. 4). And *that* is said to be designed which, in fact, is nothing more than an unavoidable consequence of a particular event or measure (Rom. v. 20—&c. &c.).

---

* Works, vol. vi. 31, &c.

† Life of Christ, 173.

* Hist. of Decl. &c. (8vo.) vol. ix. 295.

If these remarks fail to satisfy us, we shall, nevertheless, admit that the best expositor of the words of Christ is Christ himself. Look then at Luke xii. 51, and all doubt will be removed.—"Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth, I tell you, nay, but rather *division*."

He here returns to a subject which he had touched upon before, in this very chapter (Matt. x. 21): and he now enlarges on the fact, and points out its proper application. Not only so: as if to obviate the possibility and the suspicion of *ambiguity*, he subjoins to his language, "Think not, &c." an explantion of it: "for I am come to set a man at variance against his father and the daughter against her mother and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and a man's foes (Micah vii. 6) shall be those of his own household." Thus he *predicted* that the Jewish and the idolatrous members of a family, would be the bitterst enemies of those under the same roof who worshipped the one living God, in the name of Jesus Christ.

Matt. xx. 9. "when they came that were hired about the eleventh hour, they received every man a penny."

I here transcribe, with the view of refuting it, an observation of Mr. Evanson's, who says,*

"——in this parable, though the labourers who had wrought the entire day, having received the bare payment they had earned, had certainly no right to complain of injustice in the householder, nor to controul his generosity towards the others, in giving them more than they had earned; yet surely they must feel the great difference between his mere justice to themselves and his extraordinary liberality to those who had wrought but one hour, and we cannot wonder that they murmured at so seemly unreasonable a preference and partiality in the distribution of his bounty."

Now, the slightest perusal of the sixth and seventh verses, may satisfy us, that *preference and partiality* had no concern in this transaction, but that the householder proceeded on the equitable principle of rewarding "the willing mind," which, from circumstances beyond its controul, could not fulfill all its wishes. It is no irrational inference from these verses, that the labourers hired after an early hour in the morning, would cheerfully have worked the whole day, had their services been simultaneously engaged, in sufficient time.

The parable of the labourers in the vineyard, is referred by Mr. Cappe to the case of the apostles,* by Mr. Kenrick, (Expos. in loc.†) to that of individual men under the gospel dispensation. I cannot but be of opinion, that it represents the measures of Divine Providence in different ages, and eminently among these events the calling of the Gentiles and the murmurs of the Jews, who complained not so much that the Heathens were admitted into a state of covenant with God, as that they were admitted on other and apparently more beneficial conditions than themselves. According to this interpretation, there can be no difficulty in explaining the words with which the parable is introduced and closed.

---

* Dissonance, &c, 210, 211. (2nd ed.)

* Life of Christ, 328, 329.

† Mon. Rep. Vol. iv. 626, 627.

Rom. xvi. 3. "Greet *Priscilla* and Aquila,"—

In Griesbach's text it is "*Prisca* and Aquila." Luke, in Acts xviii. 2, &c. calls her *Priscilla*, of which name *Prisca* is a contraction.* From this seeming discrepancy therefore between the epistle and the history we deduce an argument in behalf of both. Paul, writing to some of the native inhabitants of Rome, would naturally enough make use of the Roman abbreviation: Luke, a Grecian, retained, as naturally, the Greek appellation.

Eph. iv. 29.—"that which is good to the use of *edifying*."

Newcome translates the clause thus: "that which is good to the edification of the *faith*," and, in his note, says," The reading of πιϛεως is well established by MSS. &c. and is preferred by Bengelius and *Griesbach*."

Yet in *neither* of his editions has Griesbach received it into the text; and *the former* alone was employed by the learned primate. In *this* (1775) πιϛεως, it is true, is marked with the sign of *preference:* in the latter (1806) it is characterized as of *inferior probability*.

The editors of the *Improved Version*, &c.† have copied Newcome's observation, without comment or reserve. They would scarcely have adopted it in its full extent, had they made themselves acquainted with Griesbach's last decision on the reading.

Philipp. i. 14.—"many of *the brethren in the Lord, waxing confident* by my bonds, are *much more bold* to speak the word without fear.

The "brethren in the Lord," were some of the Christians at Rome (Acts xxviii. 14), whence this epistle was written. It is evident from 2 Tim. iv. 16 that, on Paul's first appearance before the civil power, they timidly *forsook him:* the passage under our review, shews that his own situation and example had inspired them with courage. Now this information, presented to us, as it is, very artlessly and incidentally, bespeaks truth and nature: and, when read in connexion with the three following verses, it adds strength to the opinion that there was a Christian church, of no recent standing, in the metropolis of the world.

Philipp. iv. 14 "ye have well done that ye did communicate with my affliction."

Mr. Evanson seems to regard the fact thus stated as inconsistent with Paul's uniform avowal that he always maintained himself by his own labour (1 Cor. ix. 15, and 18). But as our author admits, on the authority of 2 Cor. xi. 9, that the Macedonian converts supplied the pecuniary deficiency occasioned by the persecutions which interrupted the manual labour of the apostle, what is there of improbability in the supposition that this labour was in part suspended, and in some degree unproductive, at Rome? Dissonance, &c. ut sup. 316, 317. At any rate, it could have been little if at all exercised during his previous voyage; so that his means of living would be proportionably exhausted.

---

* Grot. Annot. in loc.

† I am happy to learn that a new impression is projected of this work, the general excellence of which will be acknowledged by most persons who are conversant with biblical and scriptural criticism. As the editors will, no doubt, gladly avail themselves of the suggestions of a friend, I take the liberty of reminding them that it was the emperor *Ferdinand the First* who patronized the printed edition of the *Peshito*, in 1552.—Introd. to I. V. § v.

Though Paul's confinement in this city was comparatively liberal (Acts xxviii. 16, 30), he was, nevertheles, detained in custody, *agreeably to the usage of the Romans;* for the nature and the effect of which Lardner may be consulted (Works, vol. i. 231—236, and 2 Tim. i. 16).

1 Tim. vi. 13, "who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession."

The literal rendering of the three last words, is *the* good confession—emphatically, *the* excellent, *the* honourable: Wakefield alone, of those translators of the New Testament into English with whom I am acquainted, has here done justice to the original.

N.

On the Use of Vocal and Instrumental Music in Public Worship.

[Continued from p. 127.]

Sir,

I have already stated the arguments which appear to me to prove that the apostles did not regard the use of instrumental music in connexion with devotional singing, as inconsistent with the nature of devotion or of the Christian system; and till my remarks on the passages in the N. T. in which ψαλλω occurs, are shown to be without sufficient foundation, I must farther conclude, that the Christians in the apostolic age, in those countries at least where the use of instrumental music was prevalent, did employ it with their devotional singing, both private and public. If it could be shown, however, that in the ages immediately succeeding that of the apostles, instrumental music not only was not employed in such circumstances, but was even regarded as inconsistent with Christian devotion, it would furnish a considerable presumption in the supposition that this was the opinion of the apostles also. A great deal of assertion to this purpose is to be found in some writers; but I cannot discover their proofs. I shall give an abstract of all I can collect on the subject, from the writers of the two centuries immediately succeeding the ministry of Christ; and I think it will be perceived that our information is utterly inadequate to form any satisfactory conclusion, as to the opinions of the Christians of that period, on the subject in question, or even any general conclusion as to their practice. Mr. Pierce (Col. iii. 16), after stating that he had nothing to say "concerning the manner in which Christians used to sing at home, or in their assemblies, in the apostles' times," continues, "Perhaps some light might be given to it, if we could discover what the custom was in the ages that were nearest to them; but that seems hitherto to be as dark and uncertain as the other."

1, My first quotation may be thought by some to give all the light which is requisite. Philo, (fl. A. D. 40.) speaking of the Therapeutæ, says, "He who presides, after having explained some difficult passages in the scriptures, rises and sings a hymn of praise, which he has himself composed, or which he has taken from their ancient poets. Those who follow him, also sing other songs in their turn, and according to their rank, all the rest of the assembly listening in profound silence, except that when the hymn is finishing, they join altogether, both men and women, to sing the amens and hallelujahs." Philo mentions also another method of singing practised by this sect. "After supper their sacred songs began. They all rose up, and selected two choirs, one of men and another of women; and from each of them one person of majestic appearance and musical skill was chosen to lead the band. They then chaunted hymns in honour of God, composed in different metres; sometimes singing together, at other times in responsive alternation."—Many have imagined that the Therapeutæ were Christians; and even Eusebius speaks of them thus, though his account of them from Philo completely confutes the supposition. It is now generally admitted, that they were a sect of Jewish ascetics, at Alexandria, existing in considerable numbers before Christianity could have been much known in this place.—From the particular account which Philo gives of their mode of singing, it is most probable that the Therapeutæ did not employ instrumental accompaniments.*

2, Pliny, (A. D. 107.) in his well-known letter to Trajan (x. 97.) states, that the Christians who were brought before him in Asia Minor, "affirmed, that this was the whole of their fault or error, that they had been accustomed to meet together on a stated day, before it was light, and sang among themselves alternately a hymn to Christ as a God:* (*carmenque*

---

* The extracts from Philo are derived from Beausobre and L'Enfant's Preface to the Epistle to the Ephesians.—If the Therapeutæ had been Christians, it would at once have been inferred, from the silence of Philo, as to the use of instrumental music among them, that they must have objected to the introduction of it into their devotional services; and this would have supplied an argument against the use of it in ours. As they certainly were not Christians, there will be little difficulty in admitting, that if they did not employ instrumental accompaniments, it arose from some other cause; for instance, that instrumental music was at that time less common in Egypt than in Asia Minor, or that the Jews were less skilled in the use of it than others. During the Babylonish captivity they hung their harps on the willows; and it seems probable that they used them but little afterwards.

* This is Lardner's Translation of the clause, (Jewish and Heathen Test. ch. ix.) "What Pliny means (he afterwards says) by *secum invicem*, which I have rendered by *among themselves alternately*, I cannot say distinctly. Justin says, 'they stood up and offered up prayers and thanksgivings together; and when the president had concluded, all the people said Amen.' Perhaps this is what Pliny means."—Though I am not concerned with the passage, in connection with the doctrine of the proper Deity of Christ, it may be as well to mention, that no inference could be justly derived from it, as to the opinions of the primitive Christians, unless it could be shewn that the words *quasi deo* (as to a god) were the words of the Christians themselves. If they told Pliny no more than that they used hymns in praise of Christ, the Heathen governor would naturally represent it as he has done.

Supposing, however, that the *quasi deo* were their own words, in what sense they used the appellation *deus*, *Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem.*) On this passage I have to observe, 1, that it is very far from certain, that Pliny means, by *carmen*, a song or hymn : the word may denote any established solemn formula, any preconceived form, whether in verse or prose, what ever be its subject.* 2, I do not know that any adequate reason can be assigned for *Pliny's* using *dicere*, *to say*, if he meant that the Christians *sung* the *carmen*, whatever it was. They met before day-break, doubtless to avoid the observation of their persecutors; and they would from the same cause, naturally employ the more quiet modes of worship. 3, Whatever mode was employed, the carmen was used by the Christians, *secum invicem*, each one by himself in turns. This I conceive to be the true force of the expression; and if they really did sing, their mode of doing it, probably, resembled the first mentioned plan of the Therapeutæ, and the method adopted in Tertullian's time. It is clear that in this case we should still be without any means of determining whether or not the primitive Christians used instrumental accompaniments with their devotional songs ; and at any rate, we could not possibly infer any thing from Pliny's words, as to their views on the propriety of employing them. I think it by far the most probable that they did not sing, and in this I am confirmed by the testimony of

3, Justin Martyr†. This eminent writer flourished in the former part, and till beyond the middle of the second century. He is placed by Lardner at A. D. 140. Williams (Psalm. Evang. vol. ii. p. 31) says that Justin describes *singing* as a principal part of the worship of the primitive Christians; and he refers to Burney's History of Music, vol. ii. p. 3, 4, where that writer speaks of Justin's having left " a clear and indisputable testimony to the early use of *hymns* by the Christians 'approving ourselves grateful to God, by celebrating his praises with *hymns* and other solemnities.'" The passage referred to is in his Apology to Antoninus Pius (p. 60, of the Paris Ed.) He there repels the charge urged against the Christians that they were Atheists ; stating their belief that the Maker of all things does not require libations and burnt-offerings, and that they

---

would be absolutely uncertain. Even admitting (what I see *no* reason to believe,) that they regarded him as truly God, and farther, that their *carmen* was, properly speaking, a prayer, I should say, that they had not learnt their Christianity from our scriptures. But when we consider, that half a century *after*, Justin Martyr, who was acquainted with the practice of the Asiatic churches, represents the Christians as worshipping the Creator of all, the Father, through Christ or in his name, we have good reason to conclude, that these earlier disciples had not forsaken the precepts and practice of the apostles ; and that if the *carmen* were not simply a hymn in honour of Christ, but really a prayer, it was, as Lardner says, " a prayer to God upon Christian principles, in which God was praised for all the blessings of the Christian revelation."

* See among other authorities the note (n) in Lardner.

† Justin Martyr was born in Palestine. During his studies he travelled to Egypt, where he was converted A. D. 132. He went to Rome, in the reign of Antoninus Pius, where he drew up his first Apology, A. D. 160. He then went into the east, visiting Ephesus ; whence he returned to Rome. There he wrote his second Apology, and soon afterwards suffered martyrdom, A. D. 165.

praised him by prayer and thanksgiving; that they did not consume in sacrifices the things which he created for food, but (regarding this as the only honour worthy of him,) employed them for themselves and the needy, and under the influence of gratitude, offered rational ceremonies and hymns for his various mercies: *δια λογου πομπας και ὑμνους πεμπειν.* If there were no other passage in his works bearing on the subject, I should from this willingly admit it to be not improbable, that the Christians in Justin's time commonly *sung* hymns; (though still I know not how any decisive inference could be derived from it as to their employment or non-employment of instrumental accompaniments: *) But the fact is, that the reading or recital of David's Psalms, or of any similar devotional compositions, is the most that is necessarily implied in this passage, and when Justin is giving a particular account of the public worship of the Christians, he takes no notice whatever of psalmody.

I will insert in a note the whole of the passage just referred to;† and though it affords negative evidence only, I cannot but regard it as proving, not only that singing did not form a *principal* part in the worship of the Christians of Europe and Asia in Justin's time, but even that it was not employed at all in their public worship.

4. But Justin Martyr has by some been supposed to declare, "that the use of singing with instrumental music was not received in the Christian churches as it was among the Jews, but only the use of the plain song;" and it has been said that this testimony seems incontrovertible. The fact is, the treatise in which this passage is contained (Quæstiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos), though printed with Justin's works, is universally allowed to have been composed by a much later writer, and is attributed to the fifth or sixth century.‡ The author is

---

* We continually speak of the *singing* in those places of worship where instrumental accompaniments are employed, without making any allusion to them I do not therefore perceive that a writer's silence respecting instrumental accompaniments, when he is speaking of the psalmody of the Christians, is in itself considered, any proof that it was with the voice alone.

† After giving an account of the Eucharist, as performed after a baptismal service, Justin proceeds; "On the day which is called Sunday, all who live in the cities or in the country, assemble in one place, and a convenient portion is read of the records of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets: and then the reader ceasing, the president gives suitable instructions and exhorts to the imitation of the excellencies displayed in them. Then we all rise up together, and pray; and as I have before stated, when our prayers are ended, the bread is offered, and the wine and water." [These appear to have been mixed together, as mention is before made of a cup of wine and water.] "And the president in like manner offers up prayers and thanksgivings to the best of his abilities, and the people audibly express their assent by saying the Amen. The things for which thanksgivings have been offered are then distributed, and every one partakes of them; and to those who are not present they are sent by the deacons. Then those who are affluent and liberal give each what he chooses; and the money which is collected, is laid up with (*παρα*) the president, who gives aid to the orphan and widow, and to those whom disease or any other cause has reduced to want, and to the prisoner and the stranger; and in short, takes care of all who need relief."

‡ The writer warmly defends singing, by appealing to its effects on the mind: he condemns instrumental ac-

supposed to have been a Pelagian of Syria; and his statements are conclusive respecting the non-employment of instrumental music in public worship, in his age and country; but no farther, since we know from indisputable authority, that it had been introduced into public worship at latest during the time of Constantine.

5, Lucian (fl. A. D. 176), says Burney, (Hist. of Music, vol. ii. p 3). "speaks of the psalm-singing rage of the first Christians." Supposing Burney's account to be correct, it proves nothing as to the mode adopted by the early Christians: it leaves it uncertain for instance, whether it were with or without instrumental accompaniments. Here again, however, we are left in darkness; for if Burney refers (which appears certain) to the dialogue called Philopatics, he should have stated, that it is most probable that the Philopatics was not written by Lucian, but is a production of the third or fourth century.* All that occurs in the Philopatics is, that some of the Christians spoke of themselves as spending whole nights in singing hymns.

6, Clemens Alexandrinus (fl. A. D. 194) is to be considered as a testimony of the latter part of the second century. Several passages which are quoted or referred to by Lord King (Primitive Church Pt. ii. c. i. § 2), as well as some others which he has not noticed, clearly prove, that in Africa, at least, singing was very common among his contemporaries; and the good Father himself appears to have been very fond of it. I believe, however, that only one of these passages has any reference to public worship; and this appears to me decidedly favourable to the supposition that instrumental accompaniments were employed with the voice. It is in the Admonition to the Gentiles. (p. 74, Par. ed.) In order to give his Heathen reader a vivid idea of their religious services, he contrasts them with the Bacchanalian mysteries. He speaks of the church as the mount beloved by God. The sisters of Semele do not, he says, perform their orgies in it; "but the daughters of God, beautiful lambs, celebrate there the venerable orgies of the word, leading on a modest chorus. The chorus are the just: the song is the hymn of the universal sovereign: the virgins sing it harmoniously (ψαλλουσι): angels give glory: prophets praise: the sounds of music are uttered," &c. &c. The passage contains other allusions to the rites of Bacchus; but they have no reference to our object. If ψαλλω had not lost its peculiar force before the time of Clemens,‡ I see no reason to

---

companiments as childish, and fit only for babes. His argument I shall have occasion to notice hereafter, and I will then quote the passage at large. Those who have been accustomed to the solemn notes of the organ with their hymn of praise, will think the Writer's reasons for the plain song equally favourable to them; and will regard his opinion respecting instrumental accompaniments as in no way applicable to the judicious use of an instrument peculiarly adapted to simple and solemn harmony.

* See Jewish and Heathen Testimonies, ch. xix.

‡ I am not aware of any other ground for supposing that it had, than that this change in the force of the

ample and sufficient reward.—When, said he, I reflect on the situation of this society, at its commencement seven years ago,—when I consider the opposition it has had to contend with, and that, not merely from the professed enemies of Unitarianism, but also from some of the friends to that cause—when I reflect on the good it has already effected—and when I see in the present large and most respectable meeting, the guarantee it has of future support and more extended usefulness—I feel, I must acknowledge, no small degree of pleasure, in having had the happiness and the honour to co-operate, however feebly and humbly, in such a glorious object, with such company, such encouragement, such cheering and animating prospects of success.

Mr. C. then observed that much of the opposition the society had met with, some years ago, from friends to Unitarianism had of late died away. Many, said he, who, from prudence and caution, had withheld their support, have now come forward and entered into our plans, with the most lively zeal and the most liberal encouragement. Many have heard, some have witnessed, the exertions of our missionaries, have been informed of the support we have exhibited to poor and almost sinking congregations—and also the advice and aid we have afforded to individuals and to societies just starting in the path of enquiry—and from watching the progress of the society, and most rigidly scrutinizing its schemes, they have been brought, on conviction, to acknowledge the efficacy of our plans and utility of our object. Opposition, Sir, said Mr. C. we still have—but it were folly, indeed, to think we should not have it, when the universal experience of mankind informs us that all the efforts for the reformation and amelioration of man have been efficient only by their *gradual* operation, and never by instantaneous adoption. We may say of religious truth, what the philosopher of old said to his royal pupil, in regard to knowledge in general, that there is no royal road to it—religious truth, and indeed every thing that is truly valuable to the *mind* of man, must be *acquired*—it cannot be *bestowed.*

Mr. C. then said, that by our professed opponents we are indeed continually traduced, vilified and censured, for using carnal and unhallowed means for the attainment of our ends. And what, Sir, are these weapons which excite so much dissatisfaction and give so much disgust to our opponents? They are nothing more than what they themselves, most wisely and properly, but at the same time habitually, make use of in all the important concerns of life; religion *only* excepted, confessedly the most important of all. Why, Sir! the weapons of our warfare are only reason and common sense, which we contend were given us to be used, not merely in matters of secular and subordinate interest, but also in all our enquiries into moral and religious truth. Yes, Sir, we contend, we not only *may* but conscientiously *must* use our reason, and that not merely in understanding the meaning of revelation, but also in weighing the evidences and in ascertaining the existence and authenticity of revelation itself. Notwithstanding, Sir, continued Mr. C. the numerous hindrances and obstructions we have to contend with, we are not discouraged. We are convinced that though our progress, which we all hope is the progress of truth, may be slow, yet it is sure. Much, very much good has been already effected by this society. An unbounded field of usefulness is, however, before us, inviting our labours, stimulating our efforts, encouraging and animating our hopes, by the fairest promises and most rational prospects of ultimate success.

Mr. C. concluded by felicitating the chairman on the happy earnest which such a large and respectable meeting afforded of the society's labours being seconded, and its object supported by the company, wherever their individual influence and ability might extend.

"Rev. W. Vidler, and success to his Labours at Reading and Chatham."

Mr. Vidler pleaded guilty to the charge of having preached the doctrine of the Carpenter's Son, in a carpenter's shop, and urged, in the language of an old divine, that convenience for the time being was consecration. He then dwelt at some length upon the state of things at the two places above mentioned, enforcing it upon the company that nothing was wanting to the success of Unitarianism but the exertions of Unitarians.

"Mr. Rutt and our good wishes to the Unitarian Academy."

Mr. Rutt rose, and said,—'I am not insensible, Sir, of the honour you have done me, by connecting my name with the Unitarian Academy, though I am conscious that there are persons present, whose names should rather have been mentioned on this occasion, for the services they have rendered to that institution. This should have been the case, Sir, had the chair been otherwise occupied, or if my friend, the Treasurer, had not been such a pluralist in concerns of public utility, as to have his name necessarily introduced, to-day, in another connection.

I believe, Sir, most of us are acquainted with the origin and objects of this Academy, which grew out of the success of the Unitarian Fund. The projectors of it highly and justly valued the services which had been, and might be rendered to our cause, by the zeal and piety of Christian teachers, who had received only an English education. But they thought it desirable to give young men some knowledge of the learned languages, as a useful, rather than an ornamental accomplishment, to assist them in understanding and explaining the scriptures, though they should never reach those intellectual attainments at which scholars have often arrived, and which, I trust, will always distinguish many in our communion.

I had hoped, Sir, that the Unitarian Fund had now survived all the prejudices which it encountered at first, even among some Unitarians. But I am sorry to find myself mistaken. In a periodical publication, which, I trust, is familiar to us all, the Fund is censured, by an anonymous writer, especially as it proposes to act by such means as the Unitarian Academy may supply. The writer to whom I refer, and who is to me quite unknown, appears to have forgotten that the Unitarian Fund was designed expressly to promote Unitarianism by popular preaching. He will allow us to assist old and regular congregations, and thus escape the charge of innovation, but, when our preaching becomes popular, it is disapproved.

I should scarcely have mentioned the objections of this writer, had he not connected them, though indirectly, with the name of our late venerable friend, Mr. Lindsey, by whom he describes himself to have been led into, and conducted in the path of Unitarianism. Yet when I had the honour, last year, to be called to the chair which is now so worthily filled, I felt myself justified, in representing Mr. Lindsey as consoling himself, amidst the languors of declining age, and in the near propect of dissolution, by observing that the doctrine which he had so well taught and exemplified, was descending among the people, and likely to become the religion of the multitude, by the means of popular preaching.

It was, Sir, the distinguished praise of the great moral sage of heathen antiquity, not merely that he reasoned with philosophers, but that he sought the streets and markets of his crowed city, to gain the attention of the people at large. Yet Christians, it seems, are liable to censure, if they teach or hear in a market place or a carpenter's shop. I know not how other Christians may satisfy themselves, that the dispositions they indulge are becoming the followers of Jesus Christ, but I confess, Sir, that if I could contemplate the conduct of our missionaries with any feelings but those of the highest respect, or without gratitude to the divine Providence for raising up such men, and preparing a field for their exertions, accompanied as those exertions have been, by prudence and decorum, worthy of those who speak the words of truth and soberness—I should fear for myself that if I had lived in the days of the Son of Man, I must have revolted at the doctrine of the carpenter's son. Yes, Sir, I should fear that I might not have appeared among the earliest followers of him who had not where to lay his head, but rather have hesitated to come in till the eleventh hour, or, perhaps, have waited till all the hours of life were past, before I could gain a satisfactory answer to that first enquiry of worldly wisdom, —have any of the rulers believed?

Gentlemen,—I thank you for the honour you have done me, and now, as I no longer see my friend, the Chairman, in his place, give me leave to address *you*. It is impossible to regret the case of those, who, agreeing with us in faith, are deterred by prejudices from advocating our cause, without recollecting, with pleasure, instances of some who have overcome such disadvantages. In this connection, give me leave to name a gentleman, who, happily surmounted the prejudices of education, and, at the call of conscience, left the academic shades in which he delighted, and has, in various ways, employed his talents to give the advantages of a popular form to what we esteem the doctrine of the gospel. Gentlemen, I am sure you have anticipated me, and expect that I shall propose *the health of our Chairman.*

"Mr. Eaton and the Committe."

Mr. Eaton said,—I rise, Sir, on the part of the Committee, and for myself, to return you and the company, our most cordial thanks for the honour you have done us, in drinking our healths. The Committee, Sir, is an important instrument in the execution of the great plans of this Society, and I take it for granted, that, in drinking our healths, you do not intend it as a barren compliment, but as a testimony of your approbation of our conduct. If your committee have, in any instances erred, or disappointed your expectation, it must be placed to the account of their infirmity;—for more active zeal, more energy, punctuality and good intention, could not be employed in your service, and the appearance, this day, of so large and respectable a company proves, satisfactorily, that they have not laboured in vain.—If gentlemen would carry along with them, into their respective connections and districts, all over the country where they dwell, a portion of the zeal, now so conspicuously exhibited, and exert their influence in their various circles, by explaining the object, and stating the great success and utility of this institution, your Committee, Sir, would have, upon our returning anniversaries, to present before you a report still more gratifying and more worthy of your attention. This Society, to its honour be it spoken, has, for its particular object, the instruction and benefit of the poor; they are the great mass of the people, to benefit them is greatly to promote general happiness. I rejoice, sincerely, in this object of our institution; let us endeavour to lessen their sorrows, and increase their consolations, by communicating rational, religious instruction. As for the rich; if they do not want the inclination, they have abundantly the means of taking care of themselves."

"Rev. T. Rees, and the Cause of Unitarianism in Wales,"

Mr. Rees expressed himself honoured by having his name connected with his native country. next to the interest he felt in the general diffusion of religious truth, was his concern that it should be established in the land that had given him birth. He could not reflect without pleasure, on the progress which it had already made there. Within his own recollection, there was but one avowed Unitarian minister in South Wales; while at present the number was considerable, and congregations of Unitarian Christians were dispersed over almost every district of that part of the Principality. To avoid all suspicion of exaggeration he would, however, state, that though several of them were large, others consisted of only a few members; but the smallest of them were of importance, as stations in their several neighbourhoods, where the missionaries of the Fund, and other ministers, found convenient openings for the advantageous application of their labours. He was inclined to ascribe much of the progress of the Unitarian cause in South Wales, to the formation of its Book Society, an institution to the origin of which he could not advert, without some painful recollections, but the success and utility of which afforded him much gratification. — Mr. Rees, after briefly noticing the progress of the Wesleyan Methodists in South Wales, and comparing it with that of Unitarianism, concluded by assuring the meeting, in allusion to some preceding observations, that the Welsh Unitarians did not yield to their brethren in England, in attachment to religious freedom. He had been deputed by them to convey to Lord Holland and Mr. W. Smith, Petitions to both Houses of Parliament, (signed by about a thousand names) for the repeal of all the penal statutes which relate to religion, and he was confident that whenever it should be deemed necessary, they would again come forward in support of the same great cause.

"Rev. Mr. Gilchrist and the Stewards."

Mr. Gilchrist said, "I am happy that we are permitted collectively to render an account of our stewardship; for were every man to answer for himself, my only plea would be apology, and my only apology, incapacity. Of my unfitness for an office of this kind, I was previously sensible, and had intended to plead exemption from it, by alleging my holy or pretended holy orders; and though I stand on the list, I consider myself not an efficient but an honorary steward. And I assure you, Sir, it is to us no mean honour to serve, in any way whatever, this respectable company and the Unitarian Fund. I would rather be a door-keeper to such an enlightened and liberal assembly, than dwell in the tents of bigotry.

Sir, we cannot boast of the provision made for you;—we have not furnished you with a feast of exquisite delicacies, such as would please the taste of the epicure; but you came not to an epicurean entertainment, and you have food to eat which the mere epicure knows not of; and your enlightened minds, your generous hearts have enjoyed a rich repast. The purposes of this meeting are of themselves a noble feast, and that feast has been heightened and improved by the accomplishment of our wishes; it has received an exquisite relish from the success of our endeavours. We behold the rapid progress of simple and rational Christianity; we have the pure pleasure, the exalted honour, of promoting it; and these anniversary meetings are, happily, subservient to that great end. They concentrate the widely scattered sparks, which kindle into a flame that will not, like the fire of zeal without knowledge, impregnated with the sulphur of bigotry, ravage and destroy; but like the luminary of heaven, will cheer by its life, and fructify by it heat.

Sir, we are convinced that it is good to be always zealously affected in a good cause; and therefore we meet to cherish a noble ardour in the greatest and best of causes;—we meet to encourage our hearts and to strengthen our hands by the aids of friendship and union;—we meet to warm our colder brethren into life and action, that the united efforts of many may accomplish with speedy facility, what would slowly and with much difficulty be performed by a few. Every great work requires union and co-operation. Man singly and alone, can do but little, and that little requires much time; but men united with men can in little time do great things: they can clear away the accumulated rubbish of many generations, and raise a spacious beautiful temple where the rugged, narrow, dark, gothic structure had stood for ages.

I may, perhaps, be over sanguine, though it is a kind of sanguineness I wish to cherish, and which I would, at last, if forced to it, give up with sincere regret;—but I am persuaded, that the zeal of enlightened men would soon accomplish more than has yet entered into our hearts to conceive. Let them come forward, a band of brothers, determined to inform the ignorant, to rectify the mistaken, to reclaim the vicious,—and absurdity, superstition and bigotry will flee before them.

And, Sir, what is no unimportant consideration, our zealous co-operation will convince the world that we are in good earnest, that we consider our sentiments both true and important,—honourable to God and good and profitable to men, and that they are not unoperative opinions, cold hearted speculations, as if Unitarianism extinguished the native fire of the human heart, freezing or deadening its noblest sensibilities, reducing man, as a religious being, to a listless statue.

Sir, is there a Unitarian so heartless in the cause we have met to avow and support, as to be willing to lie under this imputation? Is there a man in this room who would be willing to accept the sneering compliment which has been founded on our supposed apathy, "That Unitarianism is the most harmless of all heresies?" No. We will wipe away this reproach. We will prove to the world, that while our sentiments agree with our reason and please our understanding, they interest our best affections.

Our Trinitarian brethren represent us as in the frigid zone of Christianity; they grant that we have much of the light of knowledge and of reason, but deny that we have any of the heat of Godly zeal. If it be so, it is to be regretted that we have, respectively so much of the one, and so little of the other. Let us have fellowship as to giving and receiving. There is a mode of expression in a certain district of the north, to express friendship between neighbours, by saying that they are on borrowing and lending terms. Let us be on such terms with our Trinitarian brethren. Let us be willing to borrow and lend with them, or at least to barter, by imparting to them some of our light, and receiving from them some of their heat. Both would profit by the exchange. And I am fully persuaded, that if we be as active as they are, Unitarianism will soon cease to be associated with a small minority of Christians, and will centre, as at the beginning, in the great majority, for, originally, Unitarianism was Christianity."

The above report will convey the best idea of the meeting. It might have been made more full, but the limits of the Repository demand brevity. A liberal contribution from the company attested their satisfaction and their attachment to the Unitarian cause.

Unitarianism in America.

[The following letter from Mr. Grundy will explain the embarrassment we feel in making up this article: upon the whole, we think it best to subjoin to it the substance of F. P's. letter, presuming that Mr. Grundy will divide with us the responsibility of this measure. Ed,]

Manchester, June 6th, 1813.

Sir,

Some of your readers will probably recollect an article in your last volume, (vii. p. 198, 264) on the state of Unitarianism in America, particularly in Boston, in a letter addressed to myself by F. P. The reply, p. 498, may also be still in their memory. Such readers will naturally expect some further information from the reverend author of the first Letter. Yesterday I received a very friendly and respectful letter from that gentleman upon the subject; which I intended immediately to have forwarded to you, Mr. Editor, but with surprise and concern, find myself precluded from so doing, by the following sentence at the conclusion: "After another long letter, which I hope you will forgive, I have only particularly to request that you will not think of putting this into the Repository, or to publish it in any form. I really had not the least intention of publishing the first—I intended it only for yourself. But Mr. —— contrived to persuade me; though I had no idea at any rate of seeing my name at full length in the Repository."

This request has, of course, placed me in a situation of difficulty and delicacy, especially in consequence of the more extended circulation and permanent impression which will be produced by Mr. Belsham's reference to the statement in the following note in his highly interesting and valuable work, "Memoirs of the late Rev. T. Lindsey;" p. 274. "A very correct, certainly, not a partial account of the present state of professed Unitarianism in the state of the Massachusetts, and particularly in Boston, has lately been published in the Monthly Repository for March and April, 1812, in a letter addressed by my highly esteemed friend, the Reverend Francis Parkman, of Boston, to the Rev. John Grundy, in reply to a flattering account of the state of Unitarianism in Boston and its vicinity, contained in the Appendix to Mr. Grundy's eloquent discourse at the opening of a new place of worship at Liverpool. This account appears to have been communicated to my worthy friend, by some person whose zeal in a good cause led him to see the objects of his wish in rather too favourable a light."

I am inclined to think that if the worthy minister in Boston (to whom I greatly regret that I had no opportunity of being introduced, during his stay in England,) had seen this note and known the effect produced by his statement, he would not have precluded me from publishing, at full length, a letter which does honour to his candour and truly Christian principles and feelings. The existing state of the two countries renders any communication so extremely difficult, that I despair of obtaining in any reasonable time, his permission to make it public. Under these circumstances all that I feel myself permitted to say is,—that Mr. P's. private letter to me, is perfectly satisfactory upon almost every point.

But as you, Mr. Editor, are a friend to both, I take the liberty of inclosing the letter for your perusal.

I am, Sir,
Your's very respectfully,
J. GRUNDY.

Boston, March 18th, 1813.

Your remarks, my dear Sir, afford another instance of the value of a little explanation to remove, or at least, greatly to diminish our differences in opinion. For I readily confess, that had I understood *your* term *Unitarianism*, in the extended sense you gave it in your letter, i. e. as opposed only to *Trinitarianism*, I should not have troubled you with any objections of mine. I really thought, that the purport of the "note" was to represent the prevailing sentiment in Boston as *Humanitarian*. On any other view, I own, that my statement would not have been correct.

You adduce the passage from you sermon, to which the note is annexed; and it gives, indeed, a much more liberal and extended interpretation. Had it been in the note, I should not have found much difficulty. But the truth is, that having, rather hastily, read the sermon, I replied to the note, *as it stood by itself*. Your friend's account appearing to me quite distinct; and understanding his use of the word Unitarian, as I found it most commonly used in England, and as, indeed, it is too frequently used among us, as perfectly *synonymous with Humanitarian*, I thought his account *thus understood*, conveyed, as I am sure it would, a very erroneous statement. I certainly did not designedly substitute the one for the other, or give a wrong interpretation, for the sake of finding fault. You are aware, my dear Sir, that the term Unitarian, however improperly and unjustly, has been exclusively claimed by the followers of Socinus, or of Dr. Priestley; with much the same propriety as the names "orthodox," and "evangelic" have been assumed, by the Calvinists. I was only yielding to common use, to avoid circumlocution; and in that sense alone, I wished to be understood in the letter.

I had no intention in quoting your friend's hyperbolical expression, "*that there were not two in Boston, who believed in the Trinity*," to insinuate, that he wished it to be literally understood. I was well aware of his guarded explanation, and I do not think, that I unfairly overlooked it in my remarks. But really, my dear Sir, the difference between *two persons*, and seven large congregations of Christians, (for large they are,) is so very great, that I leave it to your candour to judge, whether the former, by the utmost stretch of figure and hyperbole, could, with any fairness, be substituted as any representation of the latter.

I regret that I have not your sermon with the note at present before me. I have lent it to a friend. I was not aware that I had substituted your expressions for my own; or, at least, that I attempted to give them a construction, which you would not yourself fairly admit. I am sure, my dear Sir, I had no other object but truth; and if I was mistaken, it was through haste and inadvertence; not, I believe, through warmth of feeling, as you seem willing to suppose.

Though I am not prepared, at this early stage of my enquiries into religious truth, to state very precisely my opinions upon any of the controverted points, yet I have no doubt you will think it a sufficient answer to your question, "why I never spoke of a division of the Deity into *three* different persons, or preached a word of Trinitarianism?" that I cannot learn how to reconcile these unscriptural and scholastic terms, with that simple and explicit doctrine of the apostle, "There is *one* Lord, *one* faith—*one* baptism, *one* God and Father of all, who is *above* all, and through all, and in you all."—Ephes. iv. 5.

When I wrote the letter, to which you refer, I had, indeed been nearly two years in Europe; but I had been continually hearing from numerous friends in Boston, particularly during my stay that winter, in London. At least, my dear Sir, I am sure I should have heard of such a marvellous change as your friend describes. For taking his own expressions in their most limited sense, we should, indeed, consider it a wondrous change, that "100 ministers," (most of whom, by his own description, must have been before decided Calvinists; all the ministers of Connecticut, at least being such) "at an annual meeting,"—(and this the first they ever held, because no such convention ever existed before,) "declared themselves converts to the new doctrine:" and,

Lastly, my dear Sir, in reply again to your question, when I wrote the letter, I had been graduated *five years*, had been, according to the course of the University, a Master of Arts *two years*, and though not *now*, as you suppose, a *stated minister* of the Gospel, had been licensed to preach by the Association of Boston Ministers.—I will not trouble you, though you seem to request it, with any further account of their religious opinions.—I will just say, in general, that with two or three exceptions, they are very much opposed to human creeds and confessions; are men of great candour and Christian moderation, and would give a vast deal more for one text of scripture, than for all the articles of faith, that fathers and councils, with Athanasius at their head, have ever attempted to impose upon mankind.—It would be indecorous in me to speak too well of the ministers of my native town. But as it seems you have partly misunderstood me, I will just say, that I honour them much for their talents and virtues, but still more, because I believe, that, like multitudes of pious, learned, and useful ministers in your country, they desire nothing so much as truth, and search the scriptures daily, whether these things be so.

F. P.

Manchester College, York.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the 29th and 30th of June, and on Thursday, the 1st of July, the Annual Examination of the Students in this institution was held, in the presence of Samuel Shore, Esq. Samuel Shore, jun. Esq. (President), Joseph Strutt, Esq. (Vice-president), G. W. Wood, Esq. (Treasurer), T. H. Robinson, Esq. (Secretary), Abraham Crompton, Esq. of Chorley Hall, Joseph Dawson, Esq. of Royd's Hall, Robert Driffield, Esq. and Robert Sinclair, Esq. of York; Messrs. Bell of Overton, Bentley of Stockport, Dawson, jun. of Royd's Hall, Hibbert, Holland, and Kay of Manchester, Kay, jun. of Bolton, Jevons, of Liverpool, Ker and Martin of Hull, and Mitchell of Newcastle; and the Rev, Messrs. Dean of Stand, Higginson

THE
MONTHLY REPOSITORY
OF
Theology and General Literature.

No. XCII. AUGUST. [Vol. VIII.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Reply to Dr. Magee.—To the Inquirers after Christian Truth.

[There has fallen into our hands a small pamphlet, whose object is expressed in the above title, which we think we shall do a service to our readers, by inserting into our work. The anonymous author will, we trust, pardon the liberty which we are taking with his publication, little in bulk, but weighty in matter.

The history of the "Reply," is as follows. There is at Glasgow a "Religious Tract Society," on Trinitarian and Calvinistic principles. This Society, alarmed by the spread of Unitarianism in the West of Scotland, published, in May last, a Tract, under the following title: "An Exposure of the Unwarrantable Liberties taken by the Unitarians with the Sacred Scriptures, in their Version of the New Testament; with some Critical Remarks on their Interpretation of particular Passages of Scripture. Extracted (with the Author's Permission) from Dr. Magee's Work on Atonement and Sacrifice." Of these extracts a large impression was struck off, and great pains have been taken to circulate them, gratuitously and otherwise. In self-defence, the Glasgow Unitarian Fund have sent out the sheets which we are about to copy, entitled, "An Address to the Inquirers after Christian Truth, in Reply to the Extracts from Dr. Magee's Book on Atonement and Sacrifice, Published by the Religious Tract Society of Glagow. By A Calm Inquirer after Revealed Truth." Of the "Calm Inquirer" we are not at liberty to say more than our readers will soon perceive, viz. that he is perfectly competent to reply to Dr. Magee, and to defend the Editors of the Improved Version and Mr. Belsham.

Ed.]

CHRISTIAN FRIENDS,

The Religious Tract Society of Glasgow has been distributing, with great industry and at considerable expense, a little pamphlet, consisting of extracts from a work of Dr. Magee, a Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. which they have entitled "An Exposure of the Unwarrantable Liberties taken by the Unitarians with the Sacred Scriptures." The Society, no doubt, believe Dr. Magee's Strictures to be just; and therefore they regard it as their duty to warn you against the body of professing Christians to whom they are applied. And if the Unitarians were indeed guilty of the charge alleged against them, you could not be too cautious of listening to their doctrine. But it is unnecessary to remind you, that hard words are not arguments. Of the great Teacher of truth himself, some said, he is a good man, while others said, nay, but he deceiveth the people. No wonder, then, that the lovers of truth meet with the same reproach. All that the Unitarians request is, that you will not condemn them unheard. But judge for yourselves calmly and impartially, after having heard the parties, on which side the evidence preponderates.

The Unitarians are accused of disrespect to the Word of God, because they do not receive every thing as divinely inspired which ignorant and fallible men say is divinely inspired. As the Unitarians uniformly profess to receive, with the most implicit credit, every thing which is proved to come from God, they are for that reason, exceedingly careful in examining whatever pretends to divine authority. For they regard it as highly criminal and dangerous, to receive the word of man as the Word of God. As it is threatened on the one hand, that "if any man take away from the word of the Book of Prophesy, God shall take away his part out of the Book of Life," it is also threatened on the other, that "if any man shall add to these things, God shall add to him the plagues that are written in this book." The Unitarians, therefore, in their inquiries into the volume of Divine revelation, as they would not upon any account, expunge from the sacred records, any passage, or even a single word, which, after mature inquiry, they see reason to receive as genuine: so they would, upon no consideration, retain in the sacred text, and much less impose as of Divine authority, a chapter, or even a sentence, which they have reason to believe is spurious. They know, for example, and every man of learning and inquiry knows, that the famous text, 1 John, v. 7. "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one." is an *impious forgery*; and to them it appears to be little less than blasphemy, to retain this forgery in a book which is represented to be inspired. The Unitarians, therefore, are so far from thinking that they take "unwarrantable liberties with the scriptures," by scrutinizing them with the greatest care, and discarding what they plainly discover and conscientiously believe to be spurious and fictitious, that they conceive that they are by this conduct expressing the greatest possible veneration for them, and the unspeakable value which they set upon the pure unadulterated word of God. Nor are they at all discouraged by the sneers and scoffs and sarcasms of those who are either too idle or too indifferent to search the scriptures, or who are interested in the support of popular and established errors.

Having thus explained the principles upon which Unitarians proceed in their inquiries into the scriptures, let us now examine the allegations of this learned and artful divine, who assumes such a high tone of authority; and let the honest inquirer, and to such only are these considerations addressed, judge on which side the argument lies. The observations will follow the order of the pamphlet to which they are intended as a reply.

1. Dr. Magee charges the editors of the Improved Version with a pious fraud, in professing to found it upon the basis of Archbishop Newcome's translation of the New Testament. "Thus," says he, "they have contrived to give a respectable name to their Unitarian blasphemies. They thus hold out deceitful colours to the unwary, and vend their poisons under a false label." I quote this sentence as a specimen of the foul and unbecoming language which Dr. Magee thinks it necessary to use; and which I do not think it

necessary to retort. Coarse and vulgar language is no advantage to any cause. The Unitarians disdain to descend to it, and if their principles cannot stand without it, they are content that they should fall.

The foundation of the charge against the editors of the Improved Version, is trifling in the extreme. It suited their purpose better to make use of a version already existing, than to make one entirely new. It was their desire to adopt Mr. Wakefield's; but circumstances made this impracticable. They then fixed upon Archbishop Newcome's as the basis of their publication; and the reason was, that though this version was, in some respects incorrect, it was, nevertheless a great *improvement* upon the public version: it was likewise out of print, and not at all likely to be republished. Nor could they, without the most flagrant violation of honour and honesty, have published their work, without the most open and explicit acknowledgment of the use which they had made of the translation of the learned Primate. More than *nine-tenths* of the Improved Version is the Primate's own; and wherever they have judged it expedient to deviate from his translation, the editors have, with the most scrupulous fidelity, given notice of the change, and set down the primate's words in the margin. Had they neglected to acknowledge their obligations to Archbishop Newcome, their adversaries would have been ready enough to charge them with falsehood and fraud; and what is worse, their own consciences would have joined in the accusation. But as to the object of sheltering themselves under the name of Primate Newcome, the consideration was too trifling to have even a momentary effect; and those gentlemen of the Established Church, who are so forward to bring the charge, may do well to recollect that, whatever might be the individual merits of Dr. Newcome, and they were such as entitled him to high and universal respect, the editors of the Improved Version, not being professedly Episcopalians, are not idolaters of Archbishops as such. Their homage is paid not to the mitre, but to the men.

2. Dr. Magee cavils at the evidence produced by the editors of the Improved Version, to show that the two first chapters of Matthew and Luke are spurious, that is, that they were not written by the evangelists to whom they are ascribed, and whose name they bear.

It is only a summary of the arguments upon this subject which is given in the notes to the Improved Version: whoever wishes to see the question discussed at large, may consult Dr. Priestley's History of Early Opinions concerning the Person of Christ.

It is an obvious objection to the supposition of the spuriousness of these chapters, that they are contained in all the manuscripts of the New Testament, and in all the ancient versions. This objection the editors repel, by stating, that though they are to be found in all manuscripts which now exist, they were wanting in manuscripts which were much older than any of these, *viz.* in the copies of the Ebionites or Jewish Christians, and of Marcion, who lived in the second century;

that these Christians asserted their copies to be genuine; and that they held no opinions inconsistent with the doctrine of the miraculous conception of Jesus, or that should have led them voluntarily to expunge these chapters out of the evangelical history.

Now, how does the learned writer rebut this reply? It is by an assumption most extraordinary. You have no right to avail yourself of any testimony in *any* case, if you do not receive the same testimony in *every* case! This is, in fact, the foundation of the learned Professor's reasoning, and a most extravagant principle it is; such, I believe, as will not go down at Glasgow, whatever it may do at Dublin. The Ebionites, we are told, "rejected the three last gospels, and all the Epistles of Paul." It may be so. Then, surely, they would be the more careful of that Gospel which they retained; and this gospel which alone the Ebionites acknowledged as authentic, this Gospel which they would upon no account presume either to enlarge or curtail, this purest copy of the Gospel of Matthew, wanted the two first chapters. And what is most remarkable, this Gospel was written for the use of the Hebrew Christians who resided in the very country, on the very spot where these wonderful events are said to have happened, where they would have been in every body's memory, and in every body's mouth; and yet, upon this extraordinary subject, this gospel maintains a deep and total silence. And these Hebrew Christians, who, if they had dared to corrupt the Gospel, would have been glad to have effaced the reproach of the cross by the splendour of the nativity of Christ, know nothing of this fabricated story, and simply believe that Jesus their Master and Messiah, was the legitimate son of Joseph the carpenter, by Mary his lawful wife, both of whom were descended from the royal house of David. But, says the learned Professor, will you not upon the same authority, reject the remaining Gospels and Paul's Epistles? I answer, *no*. What! says the Professor, "are the Ebionite witnesses pronounced on one side of the leaf not credible, and on the other witnesses of such repute as to be relied upon in opposition to *all* manuscripts and versions in the whole world?" I answer, *yes;* because in the one case I see reason to concur with them, and in the other to differ from them: and I believe that I have good grounds for this discrimination.

We should make fine work of ancient history, if this Dublin Professor's principle is to be admitted, believe *all* or *none*, without discrimination. Livy relates, that Hannibal crossed the Alps, and beat the Romans at the battle of Cannæ; and I believe him. The same Livy tells us that an ox spoke; but I believe him not. What! (says one educated in the school of our Dublin Professor) is Livy pronounced on one side of the leaf to be credible, and on the other incredible? Is a witness to be brought up and turned down at pleasure? Is he good and bad, as may serve the purpose? If such reasoning satisfies the learned gentleman; if he cannot be content to believe the battle of Cannæ without believing likewise that the ox spoke, he has my free consent to believe as much as he pleases.

Only, let him permit *us* on this side of the water, to exercise a little common sense in judging of a report, and to discriminate what is worthy of belief from what appears to be incredible in the works of the same author.

I must just notice an instance of extreme disingenuousness in the passage cited above, from p. 9. Dr. Magee represents the editors of the Improved Version, as maintaining that "the Ebionite witnesses ought to be relied upon, in *opposition* to all the manuscripts, and all the versions of the New Testament in the whole world." The learned Professor knew, or ought to have known, that there is no opposition at all in the evidence as stated by the editors. He knew, or ought to have known, that they admitted that the disputed chapters were to be found in all existing manuscripts. And he knew, or ought to have known, that the sole object of the editors, in citing the Ebionites and Marcion, was to show that these chapters were wanting in manuscripts which were much older than any now existing; and that the possessors of these manuscripts maintained that they were genuine, and and not corrupted copies. Whether the earlier or the later manuscripts are most authentic, is quite a different question.

The learned Professor applies his new principle, believe *all* or *none*, to the testimony of Marcion. "This Marcion" says he, "we find rejected the Old Testament, and every part of the New, which contained quotations from the Old; and that he used no Gospel but that of Luke, expunging from this also whatever he did not approve. Why, then, have not these admirers of Marcion and the Ebionites, received the testimony of these unimpeached witnesses throughout?"

With respect to *this* Marcion, of whom we know nothing, but from the writings of his opponents, who anathematizing him as a heretic, probably misrepresented his meaning, as grossly as the Unitarians are now misrepresented by the orthodox; the editors of the Improved Version only appeal to his testimony for a single fact, *viz.* that certain manuscripts of Luke existed in his time which did not contain the disputed chapters. His enemies accuse him of wilfully corrupting the sacred text, but he denies the charge; nor is it probable, that he would presume to interpolate the only Gospel which he believed authentic. But the Dublin Professor is not content unless we believe in the *lump*. Admit any one thing that Marcion says, though ever so well supported by external or internal evidence, and you must be a Marcionite throughout. Marcion was one of the philosophic Christians who contributed to the corruption of the Christian doctrine, by blending it with absurd and mysterious speculations. But he never advanced any thing so absurd and incredible as that *three* Almighties make but *one* Almighty! And yet will any reasonable man say, that Athanasius, the great Athanasius, is not to be believed when he bears testimony to a fact, because he maintained a wild opinion? Gross as were the errors of Athanasius in points of speculative doctrine, and had they even been as absurd and contradictory as those of the famous symbol which has been so unjustly imputed to him, I should still have no hesitation in believing the testimony which he bears to the prevalence of Unitarianism among the great mass of Christians in his own time, so clearly stated by Dr. Priestley, in his History of Early Opinions. Nothing can be easier than to believe or to disbelieve in the gross; and very convenient, indeed, is such a faith, to those who are to gulp down the bitter potion of thirty-nine Articles, before they can lay hold of the golden prize which glitters before them. But the serious inquirers into divine truth, such as those to whom these observations are addressed, will learn, from the apostle, to distinguish between things that differ, to prefer those which are excellent and to value truth above all price.

3. The next objection which the learned writer makes against the editors of the Improved Version, is a cavil unworthy of a man of sense and an honest inquirer after truth. The editors state, from Epiphanius, that the Ebionite Gospel began with these words: "In the days of Herod king of Judea, John came baptizing;" and because some early transcriber has erroneously written *Judea* for *Galilee*, Dr. Magee contends that the Ebionite gospel taught that Herod the Great, who died, as all allow within a few years before or after the birth of Christ, was living thirty years afterwards, at the time of our Lord's crucifixion; and he triumphantly and absurdly argues, p. 13, that the editors are inconsistent in rejecting the first chapters of Matthew, because they represent Herod as living when Christ was born, and at the same time "admit, as unquestionable, the gospel of the Ebionites, which pronounces Herod to be living at the commencement of the baptist's ministry." Dr. Magee well knows, that no child that was taught to read, ever mistook Herod the king, or tetrarch of Galilee, who beheaded John, and who was living at the time of our Lord's crucifixion, for that Herod who died in the reign of Augustus, and who was the father of Herod the tetrarch. Upon whom does Dr. Magee think to impose by such miserable sophistry?

4. Dr. Magee reviles the editors of the Improved Version, because they agree with the Carpocratians in retaining the genealogy of Christ. Nothing will satisfy this Irish theologian, short of his great maxim of universal *indiscriminate* belief.

The editors, in vindication of their judgment, state, that the author of the genealogy could not have been the author of the remainder of the chapter; for the object of the genealogy is to prove that Jesus, being the son of Joseph, was the descendant of David; but the design of the succeeding narrative, is to prove that Jesus was not the son of Joseph, and, consequently, to contradict the genealogy.

They also observe, that the doctrine of the miraculous conception of Jesus Christ, if true, would not militate at all against his proper humanity, as maintained by the Hebrew Christians, because it was analogous to the birth of Isaac, Samuel, and other eminent persons, mentioned in the Old Testament, who were mere human beings.

What inconsistency can any person of common sense discover between these statements? But Dr. Magee, absurdly and perversely confounding the cases, has brought out the following silly conclusion, as a deduction from the premises of the editors of the Improved Version: "Thus, it appears, that the history of the miraculous conception is itself something miraculous; for it at the same time contradicts, and yet does not at all militate against the idea of Christ's human descent," p. 13. This is, indeed, very great nonsense, but the nonsense is Dr. Magee's, not that of the editors. But is this style of gross misrepresentation and sarcasm, the proper way of discussing a grave and serious question? Is this the spirit of a sincere lover of truth?

5. By a similar egregious misapprehension or misrepresentation, this very learned Professor charges the editors of the Improved Version with "adducing the authority of Lardner's name, in behalf of a position which Lardner has most triumphantly overthrown." See p. 16. I will not undertake to convince the learned gentleman himself that he is under an error, because he is determined to believe that these unfortunate editors are always in the wrong; and if they do not commit blunders, and talk nonsense themselves, the learned Professor will do it for them, and give them the entire credit of it. But that Dr. Magee's assertion is as wide from truth as the east is from the west, I hope to make obvious to the meanest understanding.

In the third chapter of Luke, the evangelist relates, that in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, Jesus began to be about thirty years of age. And, consequently, he must have been born fifteen years before the death of Augustus, and no more, if Luke is right. But Dr. Lardner has shown, to the satisfaction of all learned men, that Herod died at least seventeen years and nine months before the decease of Augustus; and, therefore, if Luke's assertion is correct, and I see no reason to discredit it, Herod died at least two years and three quarters before Christ was born. All the circumstances therefore, which are related in the second chapter of Matthew must be fictitious.

The reader plainly perceives, that the authority of Lardner is appealed to for no other purpose than to prove the year when Herod died; and it is upon Luke's authority that we believe that this event happened before the birth of Christ. Dr. Lardner did not believe this fact, because he did not give credit to the correctness of Luke. For the same reason, Dr. Magee does not believe it. Neither did the learned and laborious calculators of the difference between the true and the vulgar æra of Christ's birth, (of which the learned Professor supposes that the editors of the Improved Version, poor ignorant souls! never heard,) believe Luke's account. *They* all imagine, that when the evangelist says, that Jesus *began* to be about thirty years of age, he means that he was five-and-thirty or six-and-thirty, or even seven-and-thirty years old. This *they* call using a round number; and *they* impute to a historian, whom they regard as inspired, an incorrectness of language, of which any common writer would be ashamed. The Unitarians hope that they shall not be accused of "*taking unwarrantable liberties with the sacred scriptures*," because they believe that the evangelical historian wrote from the best information, and that he means what his words properly express.

Dr. Magee has with his usual politeness corrected a slip of the pen, or an error of the press, respecting Ephrēm the Syrian, who was in truth a writer of the fourth century, and not of the sixth, as it is misstated in the Introduction to the Improved Version. The Editors will, no doubt, avail themselves of his friendly hint in their next edition. The mistake was indeed obvious to every child in ecclesiastical history.

6. In p. 17, Dr. Magee cavils at the translation and the interpretation given in the Improved Version of the first verses in the Gospel of John; but though he has shown his good-will to find fault, he has also shown his good-sense in not presuming to assert, that the original will not bear the sense annexed by the editors. And in particular, he will not venture to deny, that the almost uniform sense of the phrase "in the beginning," or "from the beginning," in John's writings, is the beginning of our Lord's ministry; and that the word (εγενετο) which the common version renders *made*, and the Improved Version, *done*, never signifies to *create*. All that the learned Professor ventures to do in this case, is to use contemptuous and insulting language, which is always at hand, and never fails to supply a defect of argument.

7. In p. 19, the learned Professor strains hard to be very severe upon Mr. Lindsey and the editors of the Improved Version, for their observations upon the prayer of Stephen, addressed to Jesus, whom he then saw either in reality or in vision Mr. Lindsey's observation is, that "Stephen calls him the Son of Man (*i e.* a human being) in his highest state of exaltation," which Dr. Magee will not deny. The editors remark, that "this address of Stephen to Jesus when he actually saw him, does not authorise us to offer prayers to him, now he is invisible." And surely it is sufficiently obvious, that it may be rational and proper to converse with and ask favours of a friend who is present, when it would argue folly and insanity to talk to him in the same manner if he is many miles distant, out of sight and out of hearing. And yet the learned Professor makes a mighty mystery of this plain argument, and professes great alarm about it, as though it led directly to popery, to idolatry, and to the denial of religious homage to every invisible being, without excepting the Invisible, Supreme, Omnipresent and Omnipotent God. Is it *possible* that he can be serious in this representation?

8. Dr. Magee, having sufficiently vented his indignation against the editors of the Improved Version, next points his artillery at the late learned and excellent Gilbert Wakefield, who, too partial to the Ethiopic version, upon the authority of that version, retains the word *God* in Acts xx. 28. in opposition to the uniform testimony of the best manuscripts and versions, which read *Lord*. Mr. Wakefield, however, supports the reading adopted by the public version, "the church of God, which he purchased with his own blood," and explains the meaning to be, the blood of his Son. Dr. Magee says of Mr.

of Derby, Hunter of Bath, Johns of Manchester, Johnstone of Wakefield, Jones of Namptwich, Kentish of Birmingham, Lee of Hull, Madge of Norwich, Parker of Stockport, Robberds of Manchester, and Turner of Newcastle, (Visitor). On Tusday afternoon, the several classes were examined in Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac and the Targums; the second mathematical class in spherical trigonometry, conic sections, and the higher branches of algebra; and the third in fluxions, the doctrine of chances, and the principles of life annuities; also, the junior Latin class, and the second class of modern history, the first, or ancient history, being omitted for want of time. On Wednesday, the students were examined in Hebrew, poetry, ethics, the evidences of natural and revealed religion, and the philosophy of the human mind; and the junior classes in Greek: orations were also delivered, in the course of the day, by Mr. Mardon, on the natural evidence for a future state, by Mr. John Strutt on the moral efficacy of the study of history, by Mr. Philips on the history of Charles I., by Mr. Harrison on the peopling of America, by Mr. Douglas Strutt on the effects of the discovery of gunpowder, by Mr. Wallace on the knowledge which Epictetus and Antoninus might probably derive from Christianity, by Mr. Howse to shew that the apostles were not enthusiasts, by Mr. Bakewell, that natural religion does not exclude the necessity of revelation, by Mr. Brettell on the character, offices and qualifications of the Christian preacher, and by Mr. Jevons on the existence of evil. On Thursday, besides the junior class of mathematics, the class of natural philosophy, and the higher Latin and Greek classes, in which are several excellent scholars, the students of the fourth year underwent a very long and highly satisfactory examination on the sources and rules of Biblical criticism, with various practical illustrations on the several books of the Old Testament, their ages, authors, objects, contents, the Jewish law, &c. &c. The students of the fifth year were afterwards examined, in like manner, on the New Testament; but from mere want of time, this examination could not be extended to so great a length. The examinations were diversified by the occasional introduction of discourses, by Mr. Ashton on the Mosaic institutions, by Mr. Holland on the political character of the Jewish prophets, in answer to Morgan, and by Mr. Hincks on the question whether a future state be taught in the Old Testament; of Latin orations, by Mr. Jevons, Mr. Peene, Mr. Philips and Mr. Smith; of dissertations, by Mr. Robinson on the authenticity of the ancient Persian records and their discrepancy with the Greek historians, and by Mr. Smith on the origin and progress of the Greek comedy; and of sermons, by Mr. George Kenrick on the proper grounds of love of Christ, from 1 Pet. i. 8, Mr. Henry Turner on the universality of the Divine love in the Gospel dispensation, from Rom. v. 18. and by Mr. Hutton on the Divine placability an article of natural as well as of revealed religion, from 1 John i. 9. The examination lasted five hours on the Tuesday, and from nine to six on each of the other two days, and throughout the whole, the principle originally laid down was strictly adhered to, not one of the students being previously apprized of a single question to be asked or passage to be referred to, nor one of the discourses (the subjects all chosen by the students) having undergone the revisal or correction of any of the tutors.

The examination was closed, as usual, by an address from the Visitor; which, at the request of the Trustees present, is sent for insertion in the Monthly Repository.

"Gentlemen, It now becomes my agreeable office, an office which, I assure you, I discharge every year with increasing pleasure, to express to you the high satisfaction which this numerous body of your friends has experienced throughout the whole of this long examination, which has afforded us a fresh proof of the ability of your tutors and of your own proficiency: and cannot fail to have had the effect of satisfying those, who now, for the first time, favour us with their company, that they do not, without good reason, give support to this institution

"The reports, too, which we have received of your general good conduct through the whole of the past session, are also highly satisfactory; so that if there be any among you who have distinguished themselves above the rest, that distinction must be allowed to have been, this year, peculiarly creditable. Among those of you who, as students of the first three years, are competitors for the prizes annually awarded for diligence, regularity and proficiency, Mr. Jevons, Mr Mardon and Mr. Robinson are thus particularly distinguished, and, in that order, are entitled to receive them. As the prize for elocution is to be determined by the collective opinion (expressed by ballot) of the Trustees, on the public exhibitions which they have just heard, I cannot as yet take upon me to say, in whose favour it will be declared;* but this I will venture to say, that several of you have deserved it; I have, indeed, great satisfaction in observing a very great general improvement in the manner of delivering your discourses, and I trust that we shall never again have an opportunity to animadvert on any deficiency in this respect. This will be a most acceptable way of shewing us, that you are ingenuously and delicately sensible to even the hint or shadow of a reproof; allow me also to observe, that this will be the most judicious and effectual notice of any more public animadversions, which, from whatever motives, may be made on the conduct of this institution.

"It affords particular satisfaction to observe so many of the lay-students voluntarily undertaking the whole business of the institution, to observe, indeed, the whole of that class engaging with such alacrity in those studies which are peculiarly calculated to enlarge their minds, and impress them with those just sentiments of religion and virtue, and those principles of liberty, civil and religious, which may qualify them to become the ornaments of their country and a blessing to mankind.

"It is matter of deep regret to the friends of the institution, that they are likely to lose several young friends of this class, who, from their conduct in two former sessions, had inspired a wish that they might have continued to avail themselves of the still more important benefits which this institution contemplates for students in the third year.† The improvement which they would have made of such advantages we are persuaded would have been very great; but we console ourselves with the confident expectation, that they will not fail to improve whatever opportunities may be afforded them elsewhere, and that, at the same time, they will continue to do honour to this institution, by making those virtuous sentiments and that attachment to truth and liberty, which they have here imbibed, the rule of their conduct through life.

"But, as I had an opportunity of particularly expressing my sentiments on these subjects to my young friends of the class referred to at our last annual meeting, I hope they will pardon me if I avail myself of this occasion of addressing a few words of advice to those young persons* who have this year completed their education for the Christian ministry: for one of whom I may be supposed to feel a particular interest; and for all of whom I certainly feel a very affectionate esteem and regard.

"You will be well aware, my young friends, without my particularly reminding you, that it is of great importance to the due discharge of any employment or office, to form a clear and distinct conception of its ultimate object, and to keep that object continually in view. *Your* office, as ministers of Christ, will be, to assist mankind in acquiring Christian knowledge, cultivating Christian dispositions, and improving in the Christian character. Such an office cannot be executed with advantage unless by those who have carefully considered in what consists the proper distinction and character of a Christian, and in what kind of improvements a Christian minister should therefore be most solicitous to assist them. Not in a noisy profession and affected ostentation of respect; but in doing the things which he said: not in talking or disputing much about the speculations and doctrines of men; but in a reverent and careful study of the words of Jesus himself, in order, no doubt, to the zealous and firm profession of the truths which are found there, but principally with a view to their application to practice: not in violent contention for party tenets and favourite words and phrases, or in watchful jealousy and keen asperity towards those who differ: but in humility, meekness, and gentleness like his; in implicit submission to God who sent him, and by whose supreme authority we are bound to learn what he hath taught and to do what he hath commanded.

---

* It was declared in favour of Mr. George Kenrick.

† It is the intention of the Trustees to lay before the public a more detailed account than has yet been given of the plan of study pursued at York, during each session of the course.

* Messrs. Manley, Hutton, Henry Turner, and George Kenrick. An accident prevented Mr. Manley from joining his class-fellows in their examination.

"If this be the proper distinction and character of disciples of Jesus Christ; if it consists in a serious study and competent knowledge of his own pure word, in a conformity of spirit and temper to his, and a conscientious obedience to all his commandments; if, as we persuade ourselves, your education has hitherto been conducted on these pure principles, and your conduct has hitherto given a fair ground of hope that you will sincerely wish to promote the improvement, in these respects, of those who may be placed under your care; let me exhort, intreat and charge you, my young friends, to bend to this point your chief attention, to direct towards this great object your principal endeavours. Let this purpose regulate your private studies and compositions in your closets, your public discourses, your familiar conversations, and the whole series of your conduct in society at large.

"Let me advise you, therefore, as you have begun, in like manner to proceed, constantly, carefully, accurately, critically, but above all things practically, to study the words of the Lord Jesus Christ. Continue to avail yourselves of the various assistances and helps you can obtain; but, at the same time, take care to preserve your judgments open and candid, unprejudiced against, and unbiassed in favour of, any human sentiments or decisions. Thus prepared, proceed to explain them, with faithfulness and simplicity, to those whom you may be called to address; and powerfully inculcate their doctrines and precepts, according to the ability which God has given each of you, and to the best knowledge which you may have acquired concerning them. Remember, that it is your Master's commission to you, as well as to his immediate disciples, to teach your hearers 'to observe all things, whatsoever he hath commanded;' and it will be only so long as you do this, that you will have a right to claim the title of ministers of his word; if you deviate into the speculations and opinions of men, you may be philosophers, you may be orators, you may be champions for this or the other sect or party, but you will cease to be ministers of Christ.

"But instruction by precept, even in the words of Christ himself, will be of little avail, unless you exhibit, at the same time, a pattern of the temper, character, and duties of real Christianity, in your conduct. I am far from being of the opinion of a late biographer,* 'that the principal part of a pastor's work is in the house of God.' Your stated instructions to your people will return, perhaps, but once a week; but your example and behaviour will be exposed to their observation every day and hour; and you will find, that they will observe this with greater accuracy than they will your public discourses: you will even soon observe that those who discover little delicacy or sensibility with regard to their own conduct, will judge with great sensibility and delicacy of what they see or hear in you. They will often, indeed, judge uncandidly and unfairly; but this should only put you the more on your guard against 'all appearance of evil.'

"Not that I mean to advise you to high pretensions, or an affectation of great appearances. This would be taking up a credit with mankind, which it would require an uncommon capital to answer; and if it should not be answered, the man who assumes it will soon become a bankrupt in the esteem of the discerning and the wise. No: 'let your light so shine before men, that they, seeing your good works, may glorify your Father who is in heaven;' let it be your ambition to engage and charm the affections of your people by the simplicity, meekness, modesty, and humility of your manners, by the purity, sobriety, and decency of your conduct; by your truth, integrity, and honourable conversation. This will give a graceful assurance in the performance of your public services; and when your people observe an amiable correspondence between your character and doctrine, they will be induced to embrace the one through esteem of the other. You may then with a good grace address them in the words of the apostle, 'Brethren, be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ.'

---

* Life of the Rev. Robert Foote, Minister of Tettercairn, prefixed to his Sermons, p. xxiv.

"But the great advantage which will arise from this correspondence between your doctrine and your conduct, will be experienced in the authority, effect, and influence of your familiar conversation. Your own observation will soon apprize you of the peculiar advantages for instilling and impressing useful sentiments, wise maxims, and good principles, which attend familiar conversations beyond the efficacy of public instructions. The attention of men's thoughts is thus more powerfully engaged; they are less under the influence of formality they make a more particular and immediate application of what they hear; and they remember it more durably. We are also more at liberty, in conversation, to employ various methods of impression, and many favourable circumstances may afford us advantages, of which we could not avail ourselves in a public discourse. What pity that we should lose so many of these advantages; and that our familiar conversations should so often be unprofitable to these noble purposes! Affectation, indeed, of every kind is apt to disgust; but when the train of the conversation itself inclines that way, and the disposition of the company seems prepared to follow, why should we neglect so fair an opportunity of suggesting thoughts which may cherish a Christian temper, and promote the general improvement in wisdom and virtue? Great prudence, doubtless, and knowledge of men and times, are requisite to success in this branch of duty; but let not prudence degenerate into timidity, and shackle and disable you for a service, which is, perhaps, one of the most beneficial, when rightly performed, of any connected with the ministerial character.

"But I must not any longer trespass upon the patience of this assembly I therefore hasten to conclude by applying to your case, with a slight variation, a remark suggested to myself on one of the most interesting occasions of my life:* 'a remark, indeed, sufficiently obvious but capable of being improved to very important purposes by a reflecting mind, *One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh.* You, my young friends, who are now about to leave us, to engage in the ministerial service with different societies of Christians, are most of you descended from ministers of the gospel, several of them highly eminent for their services to the church and world,—one of you in the fourth generation successively in the same family. May you, my young friends, through the blessing of God, far excel your ancestors, in all ministerial gifts and graces, in diligence, in fidelity, and in abundant success! May you contribute more to the spread of Christian truth in the world! May you gain many more seals to your ministry, who may be your joy and crown of rejoicing in the day of the Lord Jesus! And when He, the Chief Shepherd, shall appear, may you receive from Him a crown of glory that may never fade away! This is the fervent wish and prayer of an affectionate father and a faithful friend—May the God of all grace confirm it!'"

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

Several interesting events have occurred since our last Retrospect, by which the lovers of peace and of war will be variously affected. To us, every diminution of those causes, which have a tendency to excite animosity and ill blood, will be received with heartfelt satisfaction, not from personal motives, should we have been liable to the grievances removed, but from the joy that we must be affected with, by every improvement in justice and honour, whether in this or any other country. A bill has passed through Parliament in silence, which we were amused to see styled, in the public papers, the Trinity Doctrine Bill, as, on the perusal of the title, it might be imagined, that some new explanation had been given to the name;

---

* Ordination Service at Pudsey, Sept. 25, 1782. p. 117.

under which professing Christians, in most places, and the Hindoos, worship the Supreme Being. But the bill does not attempt to explain the enigmas of Athanasius on this subject. It leaves the Trinity just where it found it, neither the better nor the worse for this new act. It preserves only all persons who do not believe in the Tri-unity at full liberty to follow their own opinions, and worship the one and only God, according to the dictates of their own conscience. The Tri unitarian cannot now under the auspices of an Act of Parliament, harrass his brother Unitarian, and deprive him of civil rights, because the latter believes God to be one, in the manner that Moses and the prophets, Christ and his Apostles, did, and rejects the fiction introduced into the Christian religion, under a barbarous Latin term, by which vain philosophers and quarrelsome divines, designated the Creator of the Universe.

The bill passed through the Houses without any debate, and this is one of the improvements of the age, which with all its faults, is no longer under that subjection to priestcraft, which formerly created so much confusion in the world. The doctrine of the Tri-unity set people together by the ears, some hundred years ago, and the last martyrs at the stake, burned by order of the Protestant king, James the First, were condemned for not believing that the three, of whom each separately was said to be a God, were only one God. From the time of the execution of these confessors, very few have suffered, for till of late years, very few have openly avowed their belief, that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is the only God, and that no other person is to be worshipped. About a hundred years ago, however, the Tri-unitarians thought it necessary to guard their favourite doctrine of the Tri-unity, with pains and penalties, subjecting the worshippers of the God of our Lord Jesus Christ to various civil disabilities, equal to those inflicted by the heathen persecutors on the early Christians. At that time the doctrine of the Tri-unity had been under much discussion; the members of the Established sect differing very much from each other in their account of it: but both parties were equally averse to those few who proclaimed that there is only one God to be worshipped as the scriptures taught, and not according to the idle traditions of men. For fear of being ranked with this class, they were both equally zealous to show their animosity against the Unitarians, and hence the Act of Parliament was passed against them without difficulty. Locke and Newton had given decisive proofs of their being Unitarians, but their belief was confined to very few. It scarcely appeared in any public assembly of Christians, till the time of Mr. Lindsey, and it was circulated chiefly in writings, and embraced by those who did not on that account forsake their customary places of worship.

The Unitarian is now placed on the same footing as other Dissenters, from the established sect, from the former of whom, if they were possessed of power, he would be much more in danger than from the latter. It must be mentioned, however, to the honour of the Wesleyan Methodists, that they are an exception to this censure. They uniformly oppose the use of the civil authority in matters of religion. The sword of the spirit not the sword of the flesh, is the only weapon, which they wish to see branded. The Calvinists also, are much moderated, and we do not imagine that even the divine who distinguished himself in the prosecution at Cambridge, against the minister of Soham, is very much grieved at the withdrawing from our Statute Books some passages, which however countenanced by that French persecutor, whom so many Englishmen are not ashamed to acknowledge as their head, were a disgrace to a free people. The new act indeed is not of much consequence in itself. The term Unitarian has lost the discredit some time ago attached to it; and for a long time no one has been deterred from professing this faith, from the fear of civil disabilities: and as far as the faith itself is concerned the enactment of penalties against it was rather in its favour. Let us, however, receive this acknowledgment of our countrymen, that the opinions we maintain are not to be coerced by civil authority, with that satisfaction which this hope of their being farther improved must excite; and let us shew that we bear attached to our names one of much higher import than that of Unitarian—that we are Christians—disciples of him who laid down his life for us, and that we are firmly convinced that in spite of every opposition from worldly power, philosophical argumentation, and priestly intrigues, his kingdom shall be established.

A very important cause has been tried in Westminster Hall, and which leads to much reflection on our constitution, and the situation in it of members of parliament. An action was brought by the High Bailiff of Westminster against Sir Francis Burdett for the expences at which the former had been at in providing hustings and clerks for the late Westminster election. There is, it seems, an act of parliament, throwing such expences on the candidates for seats in the House of Commons; but in this case Sir Francis Burdett very properly resisted the payment of the sum demanded of him, because he was not a candidate, and therefore not within the meaning of the act. Nothing appeared on the trial to shew any the least connection between the electors and the elected previous to the election. It was the spontaneous act of the former, without any solicitation or indeed interference of any kind of the latter. The plaintiff was therefore nonsuited: but he was left at liberty to claim the sum, and the sum would be awarded to him, if the court, on motion made to that effect, should determine, that the mere act of taking his seat and signing the test-roll of the House of Commons brought the defendant within the meaning of the word candidate, as used in the act in question.

We shall be curious to hear of such an agitation of the question, which in fact is simply this, whether a past act is to be determined by a future one. Sir Francis Burdett was either a candidate or not a candidate. The word candidate is derived from the Romans, who, in soliciting an office, stood in white garments to beg for votes. A candidate solicits an office; but Sir Francis did not solicit. How then can he be a candidate? But he accepted the office:—true. Many of us will accept what we should disdain to solicit: and he thought it his duty to accept the trust conferred on him by his fellow citizens. It was an act of his will, by which he went down to the house of Commons to his seat posterior to the act of election; and therefore, by what he did at the House, he could not change the nature of his situation at the election.

A representative of the people is the attorney of the people of that place, which deputes him to be their agent in the House of Commons. This is the language of the constitution: but with respect to these agents, from changes of time and other circumstances, various regulations have been made by the agents themselves. By these regulations the people are confined in their choice to land-holders, and to land-holders of a particular income or above. Candidates for the situation of attorney or agent have been guilty of a variety of corruptions, and hence some wholesome acts of parliament have been made upon this subject, against which no one can complain, and all must regret that they are not better enforced. It may be doubted, however, whether the act under which Sir F. Burdett was attached, is not of a contrary nature; for it encourages the idea that a candidate for the situation of agent or attorney should be at some expense to obtain his seat in the House of Commons; and when it is allowed by the legislature that he should incur a certain expense on this account, it is difficult to draw the line where this expense should stop. But the situation of the agents is entirely changed from their original intention. They formerly were paid for their services in parliament by their constituents: they can now afford to pay to their constituents a considerable sum, since the influence which their seat gives them, proves frequently to them or their friends emoluments to a far greater amount.

A splendid victory in Spain gave to London an illumination of three successive nights. This is one of those sights in which multitudes may be gratified; but by a strange conceit in this country, the wanton malice of a few base minds in the higher and the lower classes is permitted to range at large to the annoyance of all who might otherwise receive satisfaction from what had been at a great expence procured for them. Somerset-House was particularly distinguished for its splendour and the disgraceful scenes before it: a number of abandoned profligates taking effectual means, by squibs and fire-works of every kind to prevent any person from enjoying the beauty of the scene at his ease. Their malice was particularly directed at females and carriages; and the contrast of the two scenes, the front of the building and the space before it, astonished every foreigner, who was brought to see it; the one manifested taste and magnificence in a very high degree, the other indicated that we were to be ranked amongst the most brutal of uncivilized nations of the world. Many of the wretches who thus destroyed the public enjoyment were taken before magistrates, and several suffered the penalty due to their crimes: but their mischief ought to have been prevented, and with very little trouble this might have been effected. Several housekeepers contributed their aid also to destroy the comfort of spectators, by throwing squibs from the windows or tops of their houses; and if among our readers any one should have been guilty of what we cannot but think a very mean and dishonourable action, we beg of him to reflect, how such conduct tallies with the Christian precept, not to seek merely our own good but that of our neighbours. It may not be in his power to add to the pleasure of others. Neither the master, nor the children, nor the domestics of a Christian should be seen indulging themselves in such degrading sports of mischief.

The East India Company consents to receive its new charter, and the directors have given sufficient reasons for their acquiescence. They are very great gainers, for much more might have been exacted from them by the nation. They still enjoy the monopoly of the Chinese trade: but Englishmen have now open to their exertions the eastern coast of Africa, Arabia, Persia, and the Indian Archipelago. The peninsula also of Hindostan they may approach, and we doubt not, that new sources of trade will be discovered, of which the company would never have availed themselves. The establishment of a bishop and clergy will produce some surprise among the Hindoos, and the missionaries of the other sects will have some difficulty in explaining to their new converts, what constitutes the difference between them; but whether it will be according to the Christian precept, "Let him who would be the first among you become the servant of all," time must discover or our readers anticipate.

The armistice continues, and the great hero of France is engaged, in Dresden and its vicinity, in reviewing his troops and preparing for the opening of a new campaign, if it should be thought necessary. Both the military and pacific arrangements are become interesting. It cannot be doubted that the different courts are busily employed in endeavouring to give peace to Europe. They have all suffered so much that a continuance of this destructive war must be alike deprecated by all: but the difficulties in arranging their respective claims require such talents and such peaceable dispositions as are not likely to be found in the Congress. One commanding spirit will indeed be there; and Austria, who will have a great share in the pacification, is, it is to be feared, too much under its controul. Nothing has transpired on the pending negociations, and the state of the opposing armies is very little known. Should the campaign be re-commenced it will probably be a bloody one; and the Swedes, under their new French prince, will probably feel the first effects of it. We have to lament the ruin almost of a great commercial town. The contributions exacted from Hamburgh fall so severely on its merchants, that it will be long before this place can be restored to its former celebrity. A full account of the circumstances that led to its present deplorable condition is much wanted.

Spain presents to us scenes of glory and disgrace on our part; but with them what should seem to be almost the complete destruction of the French interest in that country. The Gallo-Spanish king has been completely defeated in the north of Spain. He had retired to that part with a view of keeping possession of the north of the Ebro, leaving the midland provinces to the disposition of the confederates, and trusting the eastern part to Suchet and his army. But Marquis Wellington, by skilful marches, came up to and attacked him at Vittoria, and gained so decisive a victory, that the French left behind them their baggage, their artillery and ammunition and treasure to an immense amount. They were pursued in every direction, but outstripped their pursuers in their flight. The whole of the north of Spain thus became, with the exception of a few towns, the possession of the confederates, of whom some parties, it is said, made inroads into the territory of France. By every account the French force in that quarter is so completely broken, that its power cannot be revived till the emperor is at his ease from his northern campaign, and, in the mean time, the passes of the Pyrennes being seized by the confederates, his future warfare will be rendered more difficult than ever.

The success of Lord Wellington leaves nothing desirable in a military point of view, as far as his army is concerned; but unfortunately, in another quarter, a damp has been cast upon it by a transaction similar to those which late years have exhibited to an admiring world at Buenos Ayres, Walcheren, and the Helder. Sir John Murray went with an army to the east of Spain to occupy the attention of Suchet, and to animate the Spaniards in that quarter. He landed, took a fort, began the siege of a town, and hearing of Suchet's march towards him, when this commander was at a considerable distance from him, he ran away, leaving behind his artillery, and re-embarked his army. The account of this disgrace was first detailed by the French general, in dispatches to his country, in which he boasts of having frightened away the British general by the terror merely of his name, and these gasconades were afterwards too completely verified by the dispatch of Sir John Murray, whose letter is a complete comment upon that of the French general, and far too much in favour of the latter. Most probably this will lead to a motion in parliament for an inquiry, and it may be an inquiry; but the fact is, that a good opportunity has been lost.

Though Suchet's army remains unimpaired by this attack, the victory of Lord Wellington places him in such a situation, that he can scarcely hope to preserve his power. The Spaniards will be animated by the victory, and the French general cannot expect supplies from any quarter, nor can he retreat into France. Lord Wellington will probably soon attack him, and the army of Sir John Murray, now released from this unskilful commander, may have still an opportunity of sharing with their countrymen in military glory. Thus Spain may, before the end of the summer, be, under British influence, capable of raising its crest again, and ranking itself among the governments of Europe. It is not what it was: and that a new spirit is among the people is manifest from the new ideas of the liberty of the press. Some free expressions had been used, it seems, relative to Lord Wellington in his political capacity, as grandee of Spain and commander of the armies, which were construed by some persons into what in England is called a libel. A prosecution was therefore called for against the paper, but the censors replied, that they had examined the charges with the articles in the constitution relative to free inquiry, and could not find any ground for molesting the authors or publishers on this account. As little, in former times, would have satisfied a censor in Spain, as has done, in certain times, an attorney-general in England: but we have now a proof that Spain no longer holds out to the world, that she is determined to repress every discussion on religious and political subjects.

America had scarcely promulgated her president's message to the Congress, when an act of English bravery, in the capture of an American frigate, confuted the boasts of the new Continent on the superior prowess of their marine. The message talks of the expenses of the war and the borrowing of money, two evils from which our brethren on the other side of the Atlantic might, by a little patience, have been preserved They still persist in their endeavours against our Canadian colonies, have been successful in their attacks on our commerce, and their little squadron, under Commodore Rogers, has crossed the Atlantic, and been seen on the coasts of Norway. In South America the government of Buenos Ayres meets with great success, and its inhabitants are opening a trade with this country, which will be very beneficial to both parties. An inevitable consequence of the European war is the opening of the trade of America to the world. The Brasils will form a government independent of the European, and it is our fault if the intercourse between Britain and South America is not kept up. The congress in Europe can never restore to Spain its wonted dominion over its colonies; and if men were wise, there are demands enough on European industry to employ all their hands in useful purposes, instead of the base trade of murdering each other.

Wakefield's interpretation, "had it been adopted by a Trinitarian, it would have subjected him to Mr. Wakefield's ineffable contempt," p. 21. So easy is it to see the mote in our brother's eye, while we are strangers to the beam that is in our own eye. Mr. Wakefield, in the ardour of controversy, was often too contemptuous in the treatment of his opponent; others, without one-tenth part of his genius or learning, possess tenfold of his insolence of manner and language. But whatever were the defects of Mr. Wakefield's temper in conducting controversy, he was a man of untainted honour and inflexible integrity. Truth was the idol of his heart, and ever uppermost in his thoughts. He never wilfully misrepresented his adversary's doctrine, for the sake of exposing him to popular odium; he never intentionally mis-stated his opponent's arguments, for the sake either of sneering at them, or of confuting them. He scorned to assert what he knew to be false, presuming upon the ignorance of his readers, and their incapacity to discover the truth. Happy had it been if all who have engaged in Theological discussion, had been possessed of Mr. Wakefield's noble simplicity of spirit, which in him, amply compensated for infirmities incidental to human nature.

The learned Professor gravely recommends to those who would understand the doctrine of the New Testament, to study Dr. Middleton's Doctrine of the Greek Article. I would add, that if any desire to see Dr. Middleton's doctrine confuted and exposed let them read the learned critique upon that plausible work in the Monthly Review, written, as is supposed, by that prince of Greek literature, Dr. Burney. My readers, in the mean time, if they are persons of sound understanding, will rightly judge, that, however useful such works may be to explain the niceties of language, yet, that, for understanding the genuine doctrine of the New Testament concerning Jesus Christ, it will not be necessary to read either the one or the other. If the mysterious doctrine of the deity of Christ can only be supported by obscure criticisms upon Greek articles and particles, the cause is lost.

9. The honest and well-meaning compilers of this little book of extracts, who, probably knowing very little of the subject themselves, support their opinions by the authority of the learned Professor, and being but dwarfs in theological lore, find it needful to fight under the buckler of this Irish Ajax, having, with their hero's mace, demolished Mr. Wakefield and the editors of the Improved Version, now turn their weapons against another adversary, and aim their murderous blows at the Reviewer of Mr. Wilberforce; and truly against such a formidable coalition, it behoves that writer to be strenuously upon his guard.

There are two passages in the New Testament which speak of the intercession of Christ, Rom. viii. 34. Heb. vii. 25. In the English language, the word intercede is limited to the sense of one person praying for another; and in this sense, the intercession of Christ is commonly understood. Mr. Belsham, in his Review of Mr. Wilberforce's Treatise, takes occasion to observe, that the word translated intercede, expresses in the original, a more extensive sense, and that the apostle probably meant to teach, that Christ in his exalted state, was employing his renovated and enlarged powers in some unknown way for the benefit of his church, in a way which probably the apostles themselves did not fully comprehend; and that there was no more reason to believe that Christ was always literally engaged in prayer, than that, in a literal sense, he stood at the right hand of God, which every one sees to be impossible, because an infinite being cannot exist in a human shape.

There may, perhaps, be something very ludicrous in all this. But I profess that I am one of those whom Mr. Wilberforce describes as so *obstinately dull*, that I cannot discover it! In the extract, however, which these good people have brought forward from the work of their Irish chieftain, the learned Professor condescends to be very jocose upon the subject; and, after a number of remarks which, no doubt, appear exceedingly facetious to his numerous and judicious admirers, he sums up with an excellent and appropriate *bon mot!*

Speaking of the interpretation given above of the word rendered *intercede*, which interpretation, however, the Professor will not venture to contradict, he adds, in his bantering style, "We are told, 'that we may imagine what we please, but that more than this is not revealed;' of which it unfortunately happens that not one word is revealed, except by Mr. Belsham: St. Paul having simply said, that Christ is now at the right hand of God, making intercession for us.—God, however, has no right hand! and *interceding* does not mean *interceding!*"

As I acknowledge that I cannot at all understand what the Professor means, I must leave this brilliant passage to the admiration of those who can better comprehend and relish this Hibernian wit, and who are more accustomed than I am to banter upon serious subjects.

10. But the *bonne bouche* is reserved to the last. These worthy good people, who, to save the *falling orthodoxy* of Scotland, have ransacked the multifarious work of Dr. Magee, in which he has exhausted his theological common-place book in defence of the holy catholic faith, have discovered in this heterogeneous mass a passage from the writings of Mr. Belsham, in which, to his eternal disgrace, and to the everlasting defeat and confusion of the cause which he espouses, he has compared Jesus Christ to the Emperor Napoleon! Hear his very words extracted by Dr. Magee, from p. 129, note, of Mr. Belsham's Letters on Arianism, and extracted again from Dr. Magee's learned work, p. 486, in this Book of Extracts, and now once more extracted from that *precious* selection, published, with the learned Professor's express permission, by the worthy members of the Glasgow Religious Tract Society, p. 24, *viz.*

"Of a certain person, who now makes a very considerable figure in the world, it may be said with truth, so far as the civil state of the continent of Europe is concerned, that he is the creator of all these new distinctions, high and low, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all these things are made by him, and for him, and he is before them all, takes precedence both in time and dignity, and by him do all these things consist. Yet who would infer from such language as this, that the present ruler of France is a being of superior order to mankind, much less that he is the maker of the world? The language which is true of Bonaparte, in a civil sense, is applicable to Jesus Christ in a moral view; but it no more implies preexistence, or proper creative power in one case than in the other." The learned divine, as if struck with pious horror at the blasphemy of the paragraph, with all due solemnity, adds, "This comment of Mr. Belsham's requires no comment from me," and contents himself with the easy process of marking his disapprobation by *three notes of admiration!!!*

But, after all, will any one deny the truth of the analogy? And is it not obvious even to the understanding of a child? Jesus Christ, as the sovereign of the Christian dispensation, appoints the officers of that dispensation, communicates their qualifications, and assigns them their respective spheres of action, which the apostle, in allusion to earthly monarchies, expresses by the creation of thrones, and dominions, principalities and powers: just as, in the present state of Europe, the Emperor Napoleon is, in a political sense, the head of those principalities and powers, which have derived their political existence from him. Where is the harm of this illustration? And what occasion is there for that awful silence, and those portentous notes of admiration, which express so much more than the most learned comments of our learned theologian?

It may, perhaps, be alleged, that it was *indecorous* in the author of the Letters on Arianism, to compare Jesus Christ to Bonaparte.

Had it been called *inexpedient*, perhaps the objection might have been allowed. Considering how apt ignorant and weak persons are to take offence where none was intended, and how eager artful and malignant men are to lay hold on every occasion to do mischief, and to pervert the most innocent language to excite the bad passions of fools and bigots, it might have been prudent in the writer to have omitted the offensive comparison.

But that the use of such a similitude is far from implying disrespect to the object of it, is evident from the example of our Lord himself, who, in a well-known parable, compares his heavenly Father to an unjust judge, who neither feared God nor regarded man:—and likewise from the example of the apostles, who in their writings frequently compare our Lord to Satan, representing them as two sovereigns who divide the world between them, and who are perpetually at war with each other; sometimes winning and sometimes losing, in the eternal contest. But certainly our Lord had no design to disparage the character of his Father; nor his disciples, that of their Master. Let not, then, the author of the Letters, &c. be suspected of an intention to disparage the character and dignity of the great prophet of the Most High, by illustrating his moral government in the Christian dispensation, by comparing it with the political arrangements of the Emperor of France.*

I cannot close this address, without entering my protest against the very disingenuous manner in which Dr. Magee states the objections of the Unitarians, and of the author of the Letters upon Arianism in particular, against the popular doctrine of the creation of all things by Jesus Christ. I pass over his attributing to Mr. Belsham interpretations of scripture which that author has publicly disavowed, as this misrepresentation is probably the effect of ignorance and precipitation, rather than of design; and I sincerely wish that I could as easily exculpate the learned Professor upon other occasions.

Though Dr. Magee speaks of "the language used *throughout* the New Testament, respecting the creation of all things by Jesus Christ," it is very certain that there are but *nine* passages in the whole New Testament which can possibly be strained, by the most ignorant and willing believer, to express this doctrine. And of these nine, there are only *four* upon which any stress would be laid by a well-informed and candid judge.* It is a fact, and Dr.

---

* As a farther exemplification of the above, and likewise as a specimen of the acumen of the compilers of the "Exposure," in distinguishing between "Unitarian blasphemy" and Trinitarian orthodoxy, by their choice of this paragraph, originally written by Mr Belsham; the publishers of this Address beg leave to refresh the memories of their fellow citizens, particularly those connected with the Glasgow Tract Society, with an extract from a sermon lately delivered by one of their most respectable members, in defence of the divinity of Christ The preacher, in illustration of his assertions respecting the *supreme* divinity and *underived* power of Jesus Christ, expressed himself to the following effect:—*Unitarians indeed allow that he possessed very extraordinary powers, but deny them to have been originally his own, and assert that all his power and wisdom was delegated to him by God. Now,* says the preacher, *we know that a person may be appointed to an office, but the abilities requisite to fulfil the duties of the office cannot be conferred. The king might nominate a child of two years old to the office of Lord High Chancellor of England, but could the king communicate the abilities necessary to fulfil the duties of that high office?*—In other words, God *might* appoint Jesus Christ to the office of Messiah, but, the Almighty *could not* communicate to his beloved Son the qualifications necessary for performing the duties of the high and dignified office he had assigned him!—It is *unspeakable blasphemy* for a Unitarian to compare Jesus Christ, in any sense, to the Emperor of France; but it is *evangelical orthodoxy* for a Trinitarian to compare Jehovah, in the most unqualified sense, to the King of Britain!

* These texts are, 1st, John i. 3. 2nd, John i. 10. In order to draw an argument from these two passages, the word (γινομαι) translated *made*, must be understood in a sense *different* from that in which it is to be understood in any other passage of the New Testament, though it occurs upwards of *seven hundred* times. 3d, 1 Cor. viii. 6. is allowed to be little to the purpose. 4th, Eph. iii. 9. is a manifest interpolation; and, if genuine, is explained even by orthodox interpreters, of the new creation. 5th, Col. i 16, 17, is the text upon which the greatest stress is laid: but in this, when the apostle enters into the detail of things created, they are not natural objects, such as sun, moon, stars, earth, sea, &c. but artificial distinctions, *viz.* thrones, dominions, &c. And the conclusion drawn, that he is head over all things to the church, &c. is such as might naturally be expected from his being the founder of the new dispensation; but very different from what would properly follow from his being announced as the Creator of all things, the Maker and Lord of angels. 6th, Heb. i. 2. To make this argument available, the word (αιωνας) translated *worlds*, must be taken in a sense which

Magee knows it, that it is never said of Jesus Christ, that he made heaven and earth, or that he created the world. And it is also a fact, that Jesus Christ is never spoken of as the creator of substances, but merely of modes and ranks and states of things.

Now, how does Dr. Magee repel these arguments? Why, by the silly observation, that in "the usual Socinian refutations, creating does not mean creating, and that worlds are dispensations," &c. So that, according to this new doctrine of the Dublin Professor, the word *creating* has but *one* signification, and that signification is, bringing a being into existence. Upon this principle, when the king is said to create a peer, you mean that he brought a peer into existence! It is in vain to plead that nothing more is intended, than that the sovereign raised a man from the rank of a commoner to that of a peer.—Impossible, says our learned Doctor! for at that rate "*creating* does not mean *creating*:" you can only mean, that the king brought a peer into being out of nothing, for the word will bear no other sense!

Such is the reasoning to which this learned theologue condescends to stoop, to repel the arguments of those *he* calls Socinians. "*Interceding* does not mean *interceding*"—"*creating* does not mean *creating!*"—What opinion must he entertain of the understandings of his readers, to think that they could be imposed upon by such miserable sophistry? And what opinion must an intelligent reader form of a writer who could himself be deceived, or who could attempt to delude others, by so poor an evasion?

You have now, my Christian friends, a reply to this vaunted publication, which was expected by its well-meaning editors to cut up Unitarianism by the roots! Read, examine, deliberate and judge. If the Lord be *God*, serve him; but if Baal, then serve him. Consider what I say, and the Lord give you understanding in all things.

I am, my Christian Friends,

Your faithful Servant,

A Calm Inquirer after Revealed Truth.

---

it never bears in the New Testament. Dr. Magee may sneer at this remark, but he cannot contradict it. 7th, Heb. i. 10. Many orthodox expositors interpret these words as addressed to God, and not to Christ. 8th, Heb. iii 4. is nothing to the purpose. 9th Rev. iii 14, is a text of doubtful meaning and of doubtful authority.

These are all the passages of the New Testament which are or can be alleged in favour of a doctrine which, had it been true, would have been so extraordinary, so astonishing, so overwhelming, that the writings of the apostles and evangelists, would have been filled with it from one end to the other, and the creation of the world would have been as distinctly ascribed to Christ as it now is, by those who believe that doctrine. Instead of which, it is only mentioned incidentally, ambiguously, and even coldly, as an ordinary fact, which occasioned no kind of surprise, and which was, in no considerable degree, strange or unexpected Is it possible, is it consistent with the known principles of human nature, that a discovery so wonderful should be received with so little emotion? What are all the arguments from criticism upon Greek particles, in comparison with such a fact as this? See a Calm Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ, Part i. Sect. 8.

Book-Worm. No. VII.

Sir, *June* 30, 1813.

I lately invited you, (p. 357) to accompany me on a visit to a tomb of the royal dead. I now beg leave to introduce you to a *tomb* of the *living*, as prisons have been too justly described. An account of a pamphlet which came into my possession in the same miscellaneous collection with the *Messenger from the dead*, will not unsuitably follow those considerations on our municipal code, and the just and reasonable adaptation of punishment to crime which, in the last and present volume, have well occupied many of your pages. This pamphlet has the following title:

"A List of all the Prisoners in the Upper Bench Prison, remaining in custody the 3rd of May, 1653, delivered in by *Sir John Lenthall* to the Committee appointed by *the Councell of State*, for examining of the State of the said Prison, with the Times of their first Commitment, and the Causes of their Detention. And also the Substance of the Propositions made by the Committee to the Prisoners, with their Answer thereunto. Published for information of all such as are concerned herein. By the Appointment of the Committee, *Col. Thomas Pride*, *Col. Tomlinson*, *Col. Cooper*, *Mr. John Fountaine*, *Mr. Richard Wollaston*, *Mr. Margets*, *Judge Advocate*. London. Printed for *Livewell Chapman*, and are to be sold at his shop at the Crown in Pope's Head Alley. pp. 25. 1653."

The total number of the prisoners is stated (p. 23) as 393, "and the total sum of their *actions* and *executions*, 976,122 pounds." The prisoners were all detained for debt, except a man, "committed 1640, upon an appeal of murther," and a woman, "committed 1646 for felony and murther." Annexed to the *List* is the following paper, entitled *The Propositions*, *with some Additions.*

"1. The prisoners were desired to shew their reasons why a law should not be made, to sequester their estates into the hands of commissioners nominated by their creditors as in the statute of bankrupt, to be let or sold, that their debts may be paid, and the remainder returned to them.

"2. To shew their reasons, why a law should not also be made, that if any of the prisoners have made over their estates, or any part thereof, in trust, or otherwise, to any person, so as to defraud their creditors, and if such person, or persons, shall not voluntarily make discovery thereof, within a convenient time to be appointed, that then they shall forfeit of their own estates the value of what is so concealed, and such fraudulent acts made void.

"3. Why the creditors of such as are poor, and have not to pay their debts, their creditors having the benefit of commissioners, if they will, to examine their debtors upon oath, and such other witnesses as are necessary for the discovering their estates, paying as far as it will extend, why such persons should not be released, so as to be set to labour, (if able) for bread for themselves or families; and if possible to pay their just debts. That the commonwealth creditor and debtor may lesse suffer, and the Lord no provoked by the cruelty of the creditor or carelessness of the debtor. And all such poor prisoners as are in want, and not able to work, may be released and relieved, that so prisons may neither be places of protection to men of estates, nor of destruction to such as have none.

"The answer by some of the prisoners to the first proposition was, that they thought it reasonable, so as they might have like relief against their debtors.

"Others said that they lay in prison for other men's debts, who died men of great estates, and left them to descend to their children n *tayle*, and they prayed their estates might be made liable to pay their debts.

"Others said they were imprisoned unjustly at the suit of corporations, and those corporations were indebted to them, and prayed that a law might be made to make corporations liable to pay their debts.

"Divers prisoners complained that they were kept in prison by feigned actions, and no declarations upon them, to shew for what cause; and when they had been so imprisoned three terms, because then they might free themselves upon common bail, their adversaries would lay other feigned actions upon them, and so they were never like to get out.

"These and many other things of moment, for redress in these cases, are under consideration, and to be presented to the Council of State for present relief."

Of the committee named on the title-page, Colonel Pride is famous for that act of military violence in 1648, when he forcibly detained from the *House* certain *Commoners* obnoxious to his party, a transaction which was ludicrously described as *Pride's purge.* He and Colonel Tomlinson had sat among the king's judges. The latter had commanded the guard during Charles's imprisonment and on the scaffold. To his humane conduct in this office Wood, the royalist, bears the following testimony: "Coll. Math. Tomlinson, wheresoever he was about the king, was so civil, both towards his Majesty and such as attended him, as gained him the king's good opinion, and, as an evidence thereof, he gave him his gold pick-tooth case, as he was one time walking in the presence chamber." (Ath. Ox. ii. 700.)

Milton, in his History of England, considering the case of *Canute*, says, "It is a fond conceit in many great ones, to cease from no violence till they have attained the utmost of their ambitions and desires; and then, lastly, to grow zealous of doing right when they have no longer need to do wrong." Milton might possibly have had Cromwell in his recollection, who well exemplified the remark. He threw off the republican vizor, which he had worn so successfully, and forcibly ejected from their *House* the remainder of the Long Parliament, April 20, 1653; commencing his government with the appointment of this committee. According to Oldmixon's *House of Stuart*, (Fol. p. 414,) "The first act of civil government which *Cromwell* and his council exercised, was their examining the grievances and oppressions committed by Sir John Lenthall [brother of the Speaker] in managing the prison of the *Upper* or *King's Bench*, both as to debtors and creditors."

William Penn had the merit of legislating on the liberal principle of this committee. In a constitution for West New Jersey, which he projected in 1676, according to Mr. Clarkson's Life of Penn, (i. 170.) " No man was to be imprisoned for debt; but his estate was to satisfy his creditors as far as it would go, and then he was to be set at liberty to work again for himself and family."

Dr. Johnson, a century after Cromwell's committee, maintained their just and liberal sentiments. I refer to the *Idlers*, Nos. 22 and 38, published in 1758, which those should read who are strangers to them, and those who have read can scarcely have forgotten.

VERMICULUS.

P. S. The religious house, mentioned in my last number (p. 360,) was *Sion*, near Brentford, now a seat of the Duke of Northumberland. In *London and its Environs* (vi. 6,) I find the following account. " When the corpse of Henry the 8th was to be removed from Westminster to Windsor to be interred, it laid the first night, not at Richmond, as is commonly supposed, but at Sion; which, by this means became the scene in which a prophecy was supposed to be fulfilled. For Father Peto preaching before the King at Greenwich in 1534, told him that the dogs would lick his blood as they had done Ahab's. Now as the king died of a dropsical disorder, and had been dead a fortnight before he was removed to Sion, it so happened that some corrupted matter of a bloody colour ran through the coffin at that place. Whereupon the incident, though only a natural consequence of the aforesaid circumstances, was misconstrued into a completion of Peto's pretended prophecy, and considered as a piece of divine justice inflicted upon the king, for having forced the Bridgettins from their religious sanctuary."

Stow in his *Annals*, p. 562, under the year 1533, relates this anecdote of friar *Peto*, " a simple man yet very devout," and describes him as " preaching at Greenwich, upon the 22d chapter of the 3d book of Kings," and warning the king by " the story of Ahab."

Henry's *fair monument at Windsor* (p. 360) appears to have been designed by him on a scale the most costly and magnificent which the age could invent. In Speed's *Chronicle* (ii. 785) the plan of this sumptuous fabric is detailed. The following instructions to the sculptor will show what a gross *anthropomorphist* was the royal leader of the English Reformation.

" Item, on the top of the highest step of the said 5 steps, on the south side, shall be an image of the *Father*, having in his left hand the soul of the king and blessing with his right hand, with 2 angels, holding abroad the mantle of the *Father*, on either side.

" Item, in likewise shall be made on the other side, the said image of the *Father*, having the soul of the queen in his left hand, blessing with his right hand, with like angels.

" The height of the same work from the *Father* unto the pavement shall be 28 feet."

This monument was never completed, but some parts of it remained till 1642. The silver images were then melted down by order of the Long Parliament, to assist their supplies in the war with *Charles*. This is related by *Guthrie* the historian (Hen. VIII. ad fin.) and pathetically lamented as an horrible sacrilege.

Essay on the Defects of the Reformation and of the Reformers.

July 24th, 1813.

—μηδεις καυχασθω εν ανθρωποις.

As, in behalf of what some men deem religious truth, appeals are often made to the Reformation and the Reformers from Popery, with scarcely less confidence than if they were made to the original records of Christianity, I shall be justified in endeavouring to shew that this confidence is excessive.

The Reformation was, no doubt, a great blessing to the world. By means of it the Scriptures were presented to the people in their native tongue: the mind was roused to inquiry and action;* and some check was given to the interference of temporal power in affairs relating simply to God and conscience. It is further admitted that many of the principal instruments of the Reformation were men of vigorous faculties, of eminent piety and virtue and of distinguished learning, for the times in which they lived. We owe them considerable obligations; their memories claim our gratitude and veneration.

Having thus stated my judgment of the Reformation and of the Reformers, I now propose to represent the defects of both; not, I can assure my readers, with the invidious design of lessening the reputation of illustrious names or of detracting from the value of most important services, but only with the view of proving my consistency as a Protestant.

Well known events had induced many of the inhabitants of Germany, of Switzerland and of our own country to shake off the papal yoke. Their separation from the see of Rome, was, at least in its beginning, much more a matter of feeling than of reasoning: they groaned under burdens which they found themselves incapable of sustaining; they were shocked at the gross immoralities of several of their spiritual rulers, and something like a sense of injury, aided by other considerations, prevailed on them to withdraw their allegiance from the power to which they had long and implicitly submitted.

The Reformation and Protestant Nonconformity can only be vindicated on the principles which they have tended to unfold, establish and diffuse. But it would be extravagant to assert that either the Reformers or the first Nonconformists were as thoroughly acquainted with the evidence, the nature and the extent of those principles as many of their successors. This were to affirm that knowledge and inquiry were as far advanced then as they are at present, or that our ancestors erected the superstructure, instead of merely laying the foundation.

To be a Protestant, is not to believe or disbelieve particular tenets: it is not to practice or to neglect particular ceremonies. The man who deserves the title, renounces human authority in religion: he reads, he interprets, the Bible to the best of his ability; and he maintains that if this be not his right, neither was it lawful for the Reformers to dissolve their connection with the Romish church.

---

* La Reformation est l'epoque de l'histoire qui a le plus efficacement servi la perfectibilité de l'espece humaine. Mad. De Stael, &c. D. L. Lit. &c. Vol. I. 264.

The Reformation did not draw a sufficiently broad line of distinction between the objects of civil government and those of religious faith, hope and duty.

They who conducted it, denied, it is true, the claims of the Bishop of Rome: they even deemed him *Antichrist.* But they transferred most, if not all, of his pretensions either to an assembly of men or to some one individual, on whom they bestowed the title of *Head of the Church.* They invested their synods, their parliaments, and their monarchs with the power of regulating the faith and worship of the inhabitants of their respective countries. Hitherto, a foreign potentate had exercised supreme jurisdiction, in matters of religion, over communities which ought to have been independent on his will: for the future, such jurisdiction was entrusted to their native rulers. The change was, undoubtedly, in some degree an advantage: but it was an advantage only to civil policy. Great evils had arisen from this interference of the Popes: it had frequently given birth, in particular, to fatal divisions between subjects and their princes; and temporal ambition had been gratified under the veil of spiritual dominion. It was time to put a stop to these encroachments: and they might have been stopped by other means than by clothing human governors and legislators with prerogatives which have no just relation to the ends of government.

Further; The Reformation did not duly hold forth the sufficiency of Scripture or effectually guard the exercise of conscience.

While it declared, in words, that the sacred volume contains whatever is necessary for Christians to embrace and practice, it did not leave men at liberty to interpret the Bible for themselves, but committed to civil magistrates, and to spiritual guides appointed by them, the province of explaining the Scriptures, of judging what doctrines they teach and what ceremonies they prescribe. On a body of persons whom it styled *the church* it conferred the privilege of decreeing articles and rites: and though it professed that nothing ought to be so inculcated which is not revealed in God's holy word, it did not permit individuals to avow even a doubt whether the propositions thus enjoined, were scriptural or unscriptural. The creed of the people was still to rest on the footing of human authority: the formularies drawn out by that authority, were affirmed to be derived from the Sacred Books, in opposition to papal Bulls and Romish traditions; nevertheless, if any one demanded proofs, and still more if he expressed his disagreement, he was without delay accused and punished as a heretic.

It follows that the Reformation did not deliver men from their bondage to other terms of communion than were required by Jesus Christ and his apostles.

Assent was still demanded to

articles of which it may safely be said that they are numerous and intricate, and for several of which we discern no evidence in the Scriptures. The fact is clear in the present state of almost every Protestant Society; and it is a fact which, perhaps more than any other, demonstrates the incompleteness of the Reformation, and the existence of an Antichristian principle and power. According to the New Testament, *the Messiahship of Jesus*, is or should be the whole of a Christian's creed. Supposing human articles of religion to be specifically scriptural, they are unnecessary: and if they be contrary to scripture, they are fraught with danger.

It has been pleaded that "as the Founder of Christianity neither established nor recommended any particular form of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, he has left the nature and the mode of it to be determined by human wisdom." But even if, for the purpose of the argument, I made this concession, I would still remark that the spirit, the genius, the simplicity of the gospel ought to be strictly kept in view, when we are framing terms of religious communion. To go beyond the conditions insisted on by the author and the original publishers of our faith, is to blend the ordinances of men with the commands of Heaven.

"Protestant churches" it has also been affirmed, "are voluntary societies, which have the right of laying down their own terms of admission into them, provided they require nothing manifestly inconsistent with the law of Christ." What, however, is the fact? Are they *all* voluntary societies? Are none of them fortified by temporal rewards, by temporal penalties and disabilities? And if these be their guards, with with what justice do you allege that they are *voluntary* associations, or even describe them as being Protestant and Christian?

The Reformation would have been less defective had it condemned the false and mischievous doctrine that religious opinions may be arraigned at the tribunal of the magistrate.

In not a few instances they were actually so arraigned: and we know that, with scarcely any exception, such was the sentiment of the Reformers, asserted both in their discourses and their writings: they avowed the principle, even though they occasionally qualified and limited its application. As the consequence, the spirit of intolerance and persecution, has not yet ceased to disgrace the comparatively enlightened age in which we live.

Such, generally, were the defects of the Reformation. Among those of its instruments I shall first mention an irrational fear of incurring the guilt of schism.

By schism, or division, I mean a causeless separation from a religious society or church. And the schismatic is not only he who lightly cuts himself off from such an association, but he, moreover, who, by exercising spiritual tyranny and imposing unscriptural terms of fellowship, forces others to withdraw from it, and to form a distinct communion. At the period of the Reformation, this doctrine, so commonly acknowledged in the present day, was not easily admitted. Men had been so long enslaved by an

Antichristian power, and so familiar with its pretensions, that they were content to vindicate their self-deliverance from its usurpations rather upon the exigency than upon the reason of the case. Of this sort of timidity we perceive many marks in the writings of the Reformers, especially of our own country: we see them anxiously making the appeal to ecclesiastical antiquity; and hence, probably, they are chargeable with carrying to an undue extent their notions and practices in relation to church discipline, order and authority.

For the same reason and from an inordinate desire of uniformity of belief, they were solicitous to frame, subscribe and enforce articles of faith.

Their enemies accused them (it is the vulgar cry of ignorance, bigotry and craft against *all* religious reformers) of abandoning the most essential points of Christian doctrine. To silence the accusation, which it would have been more magnanimous to have overlooked and wiser to have repelled in a very different manner, they were intent upon composing creeds and forms, which might convey, as they imagined, their sentiments upon important tenets. But the experiment was unsuccessful: it did not stop the clamours of their adversaries, nor did it even serve to define their own theological opinions; there being, at this very day, almost as much controversy about the meaning of the articles in question, as there is about the interpretation of the most difficult passages of the scriptures.

It was another defect in the reformers that they did not confine their arguments in behalf of Christian truth to the Bible, but placed disproportionate weight on the writings of persons destitute of inspiration.

This was an ill-judged deference to the authority of men, which, in one memorable case, they had signally renounced. It was also an improper concession to their opponents, who have ever been more fond of quoting fathers and councils than the pure testimony of Scripture. That the concession was in fact made, appears from the following account of the nature of the conference between Ridley and Cranmer, on the one side, and the tribunal which sentenced them to the flames, on the other:

"The Papists," says my author,* "drew their chief proofs in favour of transubstantiation from the fathers; many of whom, and some of the most esteemed writers among them, speak on this subject in language by no means evangelical. The two bishops, accordingly, being thus pressed by an authority which they durst not reject, were not a little embarrassed."

Still more grossly did the Reformers err in exhibiting, on some occasions, the spirit of intolerance and persecution. Not to go beyond our native country, Henry, the Eighth consigned Lambert to the stake, for denying the real presence: and Cranmer, wise and amiable as he generally was, prevailed on Edward the Sixth to give orders for the execution of Joan Bocher and George Paris, accused, though at different times, the one, of denying the humanity of Christ, the other of denying his divinity.

Persons who could so far mistake the precepts and genius of the gospel, ought not to be regarded as the infallible expositors of it in point of doctrine. The late Bishop Hurd has stated, without answering, this objection to an acquiescence in the claims which some men advance in behalf of the Reformers: nor has he shewn that toleration is a subject "difficult in itself."*

---

* Gilpin's Life of Latimer, 127.

Here I cannot suppress the observations of the late excellent biographer of Cranmer.†

"We are surprized," says he, "at seeing the archbishop so far depreciate his own cause, as to suppose that one man incurred guilt by acting on the same principles which entitled another to applause; and that he who, in the opinion of one church, was the greatest of schismatics himself, should not, even in common justice, indulge toleration to others. Nothing even plausible can be suggested in defence of the archbishop on this occasion; except only that the spirit of popery was not yet wholly repressed."

"There are, however, among Protestant writers at this day, some who have undertaken his vindication. But I spare their indiscretion. Let the horrid act be universally disclaimed. To palliate is to participate. With indignation let it be recorded, as what above all other things has disgraced that religious liberty which our ancestors in most other respects so nobly purchased."

My end will be answered, if the statements and reasonings in this essay, awaken or confirm in my readers sentiments of forbearance and mutual love, in their religious profession, and induce them to remember that "One is their Master, *Jesus Christ.*"

N.

John Walker to the Editor of the Monthly Repository.

Bond Court, Walbrook,

Friend, 22d 5th mo. 1813.

Amid the various divisions which distract the Christian world, on the doctrines recognised by the different sects as divine, and which they refer, as to a mutually acknowledged authority, to the scriptures of Sanhedric and Canonical ordination or of the appointment of the Councils, successively, of Jerusalem and Rome, it is not easy to conceive a more striking one than that which separates them into believers in the Unity of the Ineffable, and the professors of faith in Persons of the Godhead. In the motley compilations, historical, doctrinal, devotional, amatory, &c. of the rabbis and the priests, got up into the form, and title of The Book, [Bible] as they have been stamped by hierarchial domination, each sect, however contradictory, can, unquestionably, find the support of all its tenets; and, in the present day, we see all the sects in this country associating together, for the purpose of issuing their sacred book throughout the world; each sect and each pious individual, no doubt, feeling the consoling assurance, that their own church, being the true one, will eventually become universally established. *Magna est veritas et valebit.*

May the greatness of truth, at length, every where prevail! Then the one sublime principle, testified of in the Bible, and recognised by the people of every land, will cease to be obscured by the clouds of superstition, to be violated by persecution. Theophilanthropy, or pure Quakerism, which must always be of Panadelphic character, will then cover the earth as the waters cover the place of the sea.

---

* Sermons at Lincoln's Inn, &c. vol i. No. 13.

† Gilpin's Life of Cranmer, 132, 133.

The professors of the belief, that the word of God is an inward light, do, in referring their doctrines to the Bible, as an authority, virtually relinquish their peculiar dogma; but there are many of this profession, both insulated and in society, who do not recognise any writings of whatever language, to be their guide, in spiritual concerns.

Would it not be well that these were associated together? Let me ask these, my brethren, through thy periodical publication, wherever it may reach them; whether it may not be well for them to assemble together, in the various places of their habitation, or of their pilgrimage; whether it may not be good to confer with each other; to correspond with absent or distant brethren; whether it may not be well suited to the present state of society at large, united by common interests, while it is variously divided by different objects, that they form associations, in the different places, where their lot may be cast.

Associations so formed, however small, in their beginnings, may, perhaps, in time, become extended, become productive of good in society at large.

Educated myself in the strictest sect of the Pharisees, the little flock of the followers (*à la lettre*) of the primitive Christians, whose superstitions, as they appear to me, I have had to relinquish, for a profession more simple, and more sublime, I have been, from time to time, considerably affected with observing the deplorable effects arising from the unnatural union of church and state, in that sect which, more than any other, becomes at once, by association, a sort of microcosm. I propose, if thou give me the opportunity, to attempt to exhibit some of the grievous declensions of the associations of the Friends, whereby the bright prospects of those noble enthusiasts, who, in the gathering together of our predecessors, in the century before the last, endured persecution, even unto death, seem to have failed to be realised; whereby their establishment, the finest the world ever yet saw, instead of diffusing evangelical truth, and extending itself throughout the world, continues to be a diminutive sect; its polity and its practices unknown to its surrounding neighbours.

But first, let me offer a sketch, which two or three of us, in this metropolis, have thought might be eligible for adoption, by those Friends who cannot acknowledge some of the professed tenets of the organized part of their sect.

QUAKERISM PANADELPHIAN.

To a human creature, the contemplation of the Supreme Being, the Self-existent, must be serious, must produce reverential awe.

Under the sense of the Divine presence, it is not degrading to feel all self-sufficiency to die within us, to tremble before the Lord.

The fear of the Lord must deliver from the dread of man; must make us regard all human creatures, our fellow partakers of mortality, as our brethren.

In professing to believe that

awful reverence towards God becomes our dependent condition, we profess ourselves Quakers; that it produces due respect to our fellows, Panadelphians.

Might not associations now be formed, in the latter years of the King, George the Third, in the realms under his government, of Friends, professing themselves to be Panadelphian Quakers.

Panadelphian Quakers profess to hold the doctrine, that all human creatures are equal before the Lord; that the due sense of the presence of the Lord, when happily felt, must cover the creature with reverent awe, and be a protection from evil.

The sense of the Divine presence is to be felt amid the varied business of life.

It protecteth from evil.

We feel checked by it, when tempted to do to others as we would not that we were done unto.

We feel peace, when we yield to the divine law felt in the human heart, of doing to others as we would they should do unto us.

It is profitable to retire from the ordinary pursuits of the world, to commune with our own heart; to be still.

When collectively assembled, under such an exercise, it may be seasonable that a brother or a sister, clothed with awful reverence, utter words of counsel to the assembly; or break forth in outward expression of filial adoration, or thanks, or supplication, towards the Supreme Being.

Under such exercises, the humbled speaker will not dare to adopt the studied arts of eloquence, in speech or gesture; it will be becoming in the congregation to be still.

If individuals, or the whole assembly, be brought under a similar exercise, a consentaneous expression of it, may, possibly, appear in the person, or be heard in the utterance of the sympathising individuals.

It would be a departure in the association, from pure Quakerism, to collectively adopt forms on such occasions, of assuming certain attitudes, or of dressing or undressing the head, feet, or other parts of the body. It would be a departure from Panadelphism, to attempt to restrain individuals from falling into such attitudes, or yielding such utterance as may feel to themselves expressive of what may be going on in their own minds.

The Divine Spirit may be felt by the assembly, without the utterance of words. The members may feel the occasion, under the solemnity of silence, rendered a blessing to their dependent spirits.

The association cannot hold itself accountable for the expressions of the speaker.

They may be, even doctrinally, erroneous; while, under the misstatement, as to the letter, they may be utterances, or effusions, of a sincere and tender piety, as to the spirit.

Under this persuasion, we may, charitably and with edification, feel the occasion not unprofitable.

Each individual can retire from, or continue in the place of the assembly, as may seem to him meet: his retiring, or staying, not having any reference to what is going on in the place of the assembly; it has reference, only to what is going on in his own mind.

The simple principle, [fear of the Lord] not unaptly expressed in the English language, by the word Quakerism, which, in the estimation of the Society, must be the basis of every good effect, wrought in the hearts of individuals, and in all the affairs of societies, does, when holden in sincerity, fit the human creature to become, and constitutes him, a member of the catholic church.

The regulation of his moral conduct appertains to the laws of his country; determination of his mental condition cannot be assumed by the association.

His professing to hold the principle, and expressing the wish to unite in the association, would render him eligible to have his name recorded as a member of the Society of Panadelphian Quakers.

His holding the principle of Quakerism will prevent him from uniting, in many observances of a multitude of people in the world.

He will be afraid to recognize any human authority in spiritual affairs.

If a fellow-creature, under a serious exercise of spirit, address him, on the things which appertain to his well-being here or hereafter, he will receive the labour of love, in the measure of sympathy which arises in his mind.

The approbation of the speaker from others, however appointed or constituted, or whatever ecclesiastical designation they may bear, will not have any weight with him.

The word of counsel, exhortation, or reproof, he will not dare to despise, when it seems to him uttered in sincerity, from a fellow-creature, however lightly the speaker may be esteemed by other men.

He will be afraid to unite with those who hold it their duty to be vindictive, in asserting their own rights, or the rights of the Society or nation or people, to whom they belong.

The coercive measures of war, and of internal police, will be discordant with his feelings.

He will not dare to renounce that dependance on the providence of the Supreme Being, which Quakerism implies.

His resignation to what he feels in himself to be the Divine will, without reference to the opinions, the notions, the manners of others; without regard to their approbation or disapprobation, will separate him from much of the policy of the world.

He may have to dwell alone among the nations, and even among his brethren.

He may be unfitted to unite with many of the institutions of men, where the promotion of good, even, is their object; but, where evil has become mixed with their proceedings.

He may have to keep at a distance from the vain sports, and from the eager selfish pursuits, which continually occupy the worldly-minded man; but this may contribute to bring him into a redeemed and happy state!

In the order of creation there are parts which are above our comprehension.

We know not why sensitive creatures are susceptible of pain; why they are subjected to sufferings and death.

In the visible creation, the weak and mild are seen to fall a prey, under agonizing terrors, to the strong and rapacious.

We cannot comprehend why these thing are permitted to be.

If their cause could be discovered by the researches of human creatures; if by human research a knowledge of the Supreme Being could be obtained; if this knowledge could be recorded; then, the learned might consult the records, and inform the unlearned, and, thus, many might be made wise.

But the fruits of such labour would always be of partial and uncertain distribution.

A Panadelphian Quaker does not profess to seek divine instruction in the outward creation.

He rejects the doctrine, that the records, or languages, of human invention, are the sure vehicles of the Divine will.

True wisdom cometh from above, is infused into all, bringeth salvation and peace to those who yield obedience to its heavenly dictates.

This is the divine inspiration, the inward light vouchsafed to every human creature, which stilleth vain inquiries, reconcileth us to our human lot; which enableth the creatures of a few fleeting moments, to rejoice in hope, in their present state of being, to enjoy the present mutable condition, which is allotted to them.

To sustain our physical existence, to support our varied social relations, exertions are absolutely necessary; expences must be incurred.

It is not so with love, friendship and religion.

The consummation of sexual love, the sacred tie of marriage, must always be accomplishable in the Society without expense.

Individual friendships can have place with them as with other descriptions of men.

They must renounce the observances, accounted religious, to which expences are necessarily attached.

All sacrifices and sacraments are, with them, of spiritual interpretation. In the silence of all flesh they are effected, in the devotion of mind. Were it otherwise, he who possesses worldly substance, could offer up incense more acceptable, than the man who is not possessed of, or who is not encumbered with, it.

An established polity or political economy, is generally necessary for the regulation of certain proceedings of associated bodies; and, according to circumstances, they will be likely to vary with Panadelphian Quakers.

It will be suited to the climate of this part of the world, to hold their different meetings under cover, and in situations admitting light, with comfortable accommodations; to the physical order of things, the stated vicissitudes of day and night, and changes of the seasons, that their assemblies be periodical; to the present state of society, that they mutually attempt the brotherly aid of each other; that unostentatious collections, from time to time, be made for these useful purposes.

Objections to the Doctrine of Necessity.

Sir, *June* 1, 1813.

Whether in the progress of a nation towards refinement, a period usually occurs, a doubtful and ambiguous period, in which the evils attendant on the circulation of an enlightened and philosophical journal, would, upon the whole, outweigh the benefits, I shall not at present stop to inquire. Admitting, that, just at the middle point, between the boundaries of savage and civil life, such a period really occurs, the age in which we live is infinitely removed from all fears or apprehensions of that kind. The present condition of knowledge, renders it impossible that any mischief should accrue from the most uncurbed discussion of subjects, connected with learning or philosophy, however bold or delicate the topics.

Some of the gentlemen who are known to countenance and support the Monthly Repository, are persons of distinquished talents and unquestionable integrity: and the judgment of such men, respecting matters to the consideration of which they have dedicated a long series of years, is, certainly, entitled to much respect and atention.

The writer of this article, Sir, after long meditation and much inquiry, is compelled to admit, in its fullest extent, the Necessarian scheme. Yet the doctrine presents itself to his imagination, surrounded by so many and such formidable difficulties, that nothing short of the absolute impossibility of rejecting it, could induce him to range himself on its side. And, on this account, he is extremely desirous to learn, through the medium of so respectable a publication as yours, whether the difficulties in question, do, in truth, offer themselves to the contemplation of others under the same grave and discouraging aspect.

I shall now set down these objections, without softening and without exaggeration, just as they unfold themselves to my understanding; and only add, that I have not the remotest wish to engage in any controversy or debate, on this or any other point.

1st, Does not the doctrine of necessity, properly understood, refer to the Deity, as to its true cause, every event, bad as well as good, from the beginning to the end of time?—God is the author of matter and of mind; and of the laws which are impressed upon both of them.

2d, Supposing that mankind, during their continuance on earth are *purely instrumental and passive*, on what conceivable basis shall we admit their future responsibility? — Where there is no choice there can be no accountableness.

3d, Are the moral principles of our nature, though deep and universal, of *no* authority? — But where are the people, savage or refined, who do not treat the disturbers of society, as conscious and voluntary offenders; I mean, (for I detest cavilling) who do not treat such persons *as if they had power to abstain from the commission of crimes?*

And now, Mr. Editor, I have only to request, that, if any correspondent shall feel inclined to notice this article, he will not content himself by referring me to any *books* on the subject; all such books I have read and considered: they have perfectly satisfied me, as to the truth of the doctrine; but not at all as to the strength and unavoidable bearing of the objections. I am fully convinced of its *truth*, but really shocked at its *consequences*.

I am, Sir, with much respect,
Yours, &c.
X.

Dr. Bruce on the Article on "Irish Unitarians."

Belfast, June 10, 1813.

Sir,

When looking into your Repository for Dec. 1812. [VII. 753,] I find my name introduced in a manner liable to misconception. It is one of those instances in which your readers are often misled by the usurpation of the title of Unitarians on the part of the Socinians. This is a continual source of confusion in your publication, and sometimes exposes it to the suspicion of disingenuity. As I accept of the denomination of Arian, without subscribing to the creed of Arius, I shall take the liberty of addressing you as a Socinian, without insinuating that you adopt any opinions of Socinus which you disavow.

The confusion arising from this equivocal use of the word Unitarian appeared of late very remarkably in your American correspondence: and as you candidly corrected that misrepresentation with respect to America, I hope you will not refuse a speedy insertion of what I have to say concerning Ireland.

I have a very general knowledge of the Dissenters of this country, and can venture to assert, that there is not one Socinian congregation in Ireland. In the Southern Association, one or two ministers and about a dozen of the laity may entertain such sentiments. In the Northern counties, which contain between 400,000 and 500,000 Presbyterians, including seceders, I do not know of one minister who denies the pre-existence of our Lord, though I am intimately acquainted and connected with the most liberal divines of that body. The Methodists, Covenanters, Moravians and Evangelical Societies cannot be suspected of Socinianism; and the Quakers have of late been anxious to disclaim that doctrine.

As to my late much respected colleague Dr. Moody, and my valued friend Mr. Philip Taylor, who are particularly mentioned by your correspondent, the former has recently, for himself, and his worthy associate Mr. Armstrong, obviated suspicions of this kind, to which Arian ministers who do not entertain their people with controversy are liable, in a manner highly satisfactory to his respectable congregation; and the latter has always adhered to the sentiments of his grandfather, the learned Dr. John Taylor of Norwich. I have also been long intimate with the minister of Clonmel, and never had any reason to suppose, that he inclined to Socinian principles.

The excessive spirit of proselytism, which actuates so many of your correspondents, is not always confined to the living. It is a favourite opinion among them that Newton and Locke were Socinians. The evidence for this is brought forward in your number for July, 1810, though, I think, little to the satisfaction of the writer himself. Sir Isaac Newton is claimed on the strength of *verbal* expressions, which he is said to have used to a Mr. Haynes. For the truth of this traditionary evidence we are referred to a Mr. Baron, himself a Socinian, who says, that Mr. Haynes, from whom he had it, was the most zealous Socinian he ever knew; and therefore surely not an unexceptionable witness.

For this quotation from Mr. Baron's tract we are again referred to Mr. Lindsey's Apology. This is slight ground for forming an opinion of the sentiments of so great a man, who wrote so largely on religion. As to the quotation from Sir Isaac's own writings, it might as well come from an Arian, or indeed from any Protestant, as from a Socinian.

"In regard to Mr. Locke," this writer very fairly admits, "that he knows not of any positive evidence that can decide the question." I shall therefore furnish him with one very respectable testimony, respectable in every point, but peculiarly so on this subject. It is that of Dr. Lardner, who pronounces Locke to have been an Arian, and classes him with Dr. John Taylor, in his Letter on the Logos, in these words: "How this text, Rom i. 3, 4. is explained by those who favour the Arian hypothesis, of the Logos supplying the place of a human soul in the person of Jesus, may be seen in divers writers. See the Paraphrases of Mr. Locke and Dr. Taylor."

I shall also remind him of two passages in Locke's Paraphrase, which to me are perfectly satisfactory. The first is that referred to by Dr. Lardner, Rom. i. 3. "Jesus Christ, our Lord, who, according to the flesh, i. e. as to *the body*, which he took in the womb of the *Blessed Virgin*, his mother, was of the posterity and lineage of David, according to *the Spirit of Holiness*, i. e. as to that more pure and spiritual part, which in him overruled all, and kept even his frail flesh holy and spotless from the least taint of sin, and was of *another extraction*, &c." Upon this he has the following note: "Spirit of Holiness must mean that more pure and spiritual part in him, which, by *divine extraction, he had immediately from God:* unless this be understood, the antithesis is lost."

The second passage is comprised in two notes on Ephes. i. 4 and 6. "It was in consideration of Christ alone, that God heretofore, before the foundation of the world, designed us Gentiles to be his people."—"And this *for the sake of his son Jesus Christ, who was his beloved.*" No Arian could wish for a more satisfactory comment on these texts. In *the Reasonableness of Christianity*, also, he says, that "Sins should, *for his Son's sake*, be forgiven:"—and again, "God sends Jesus Christ into the world, who being *conceived in the womb of a virgin*, (who had never known man) by the immediate power of God, was properly the Son of God."

The quotation made by your correspondent from Locke's Vindication of the book just mentioned, when read in connection, is, I think, an explicit disavowal of Socinianism; and if any doubt remain, it must be removed by the following expressions in the same tract:—"It would have plainly appeared how idle and groundless his charging Socinianism on me was:"—"for I repeat it again, that there is not one word of Socinianism in it." In his second Vindication he challenges his adversary to shew, that he ever said, "That Christ is not *above the nature of man.*"

It is more candid and respectful to such a man as Locke, to acquiesce in this declaration of his own sentiments, especially when he says, "I have been careful to take all occasions to explain the doctrine of my book," than to "infer that whatever this great man's opinion was, he did not think it necessary or proper, *in these publications*, fully to state it." But lest the controversial nature of *these publications* may be thought to require some reserve, I shall add another passage from the original tract: "Speaking of his own life, John x. 18, he says, '*No man taketh it from me; but I lay it down myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again:*' which he would not have said, if he had been *a mortal man, the son of a man, of the seed of Adam*, or else had by transgression forfeited his own life; for *the wages of sin is death;* and he that hath incurred death by his own transgression, cannot lay down his life for another, as our Saviour professes he did." For my part, I think it more reasonable to infer, that though Locke may not have been an Arian of the highest order, he differed widely from the modern Socinians on almost every article of their creed. He did not believe Christ to have been a mortal man of the seed of Adam; he was neither a Necessarian nor a Materialist; he believed in the incarnation and miraculous conception, and in the separate nature and existence of the soul and body of Christ, and did not scruple to use the phrase "for the sake of Jesus Christ."

I have also seen another highly respectable author classed by your correspondents in such company as would lead one to suppose that he was considered as a Socinian or Humanitarian. I mean Abernethy. As he was not only an ornament to my country, but also a member of the same presbytery, you will excuse me for wishing to set your readers right by referring them to his Sermon on the Spirituality of the Divine Nature; where he lays down the Arian doctrine as explicitly and extensively as Benjamin Ben Mordecai himself, whose Apology I shall conclude by recommending to the serious perusal of the subscribers to the Repository.

WILLIAM BRUCE.

Address from a Tutor to an Annual Meeting of his former Pupils.

GENTLEMEN,

I am convinced that nothing can be farther from your thoughts than to lead me into circumstances of moral danger. And yet so seducing is this testimony of your affection, that it forces me to be on my guard against *that propensity to magnify the idea of self* which an excellent moral writer has shown is the most dangerous of all propensities.

My high standard of duty, attended with a sense of the danger to which I am exposed, will, I hope, preserve me from the intoxications of vanity: whilst your persevering affection inspires me with thankfulness and a return of affection. It had indeed before this time produced a transfer of the debt of gratitude. Gentlemen, I thank you, —I thank you from my heart.

As I have just been reading a work of Mrs. Hamilton's which advances and illustrates those principles in theory, which I have long been endeavouring to reduce to practice, (a coincidence which is likewise flattering to my vanity,) I shall make no apology, on this occasion, for laying them before you in as few words as possible. Indeed the business of education, in the light in which I have ever considered it, is the business of *every human being*. *How much* it is the business of *parents* I need not say. My concern in it will soon devolve upon others. Previously to my retiring, I wish to say one word which may be of use to my successors.

The *design* of education, I conceive, is *to form a human being to usefulness and happiness during the whole of his life*. The *design* of education is *to form an immortal being to happiness through all the ages of eternity*.

The employment of an instructor of youth then, I presume, is not merely to *teach languages*,—important as that branch of instruction is, and incalculably important as are the sciences connected with it and the mental habits which are best formed by it;—it is not merely *to teach* any thing, that is to tell a person *what* he is to think, *what* he is to believe, or even *what* he is to *do*:—it embraces a wider field of duty, and requires exertions of greater labour and difficulty. It is to assist the developement, to favour the expansion, and to strengthen the texture of every faculty of the understanding and of every amiable affection of the heart. It is to preserve the understanding clear from the mists of prejudice, and the heart, in this corrupted and corrupting scene, pure from the taint of vice. It is to restrain the imagination, to regulate the judgment and to form the taste; that thus the pupil may be able from the most solid principles, to *draw his own* conclusions, and may know in all cases *how* to think, *how* to judge, and *how* to act.

The business of education is not yet completed. By ATTENTION—that all-powerful agent, so coy and reserved when courted, so partial in her attachments and so difficult to be won;—by ATTENTION, never asleep, never suffered to proceed in a wrong direction, those mental habits are to be acquired which will enable the pupil, in all the varying circumstances of life, to *think rightly*, to *feel rightly*, and to *act rightly*.

Gentlemen,—In the most arduous, important and anxious of all employments, *this is the design* which I have invariably had in view. To you I appeal as witnesses of the sincerity of my intention; to you I must further appeal as examples of the success of my endeavours. You will not, I am convinced, accuse me, when we have been reading together the heathen orators, historians, and even poets, of having omitted any opportunity which lay in my way, of instilling a *moral* and *Christian* principle.

Gentlemen,—If success has attended these, the principal labours of my life, I impute it to the blessing of heaven, the fertility of the soil which I have been called upon to cultivate, and to your filial affection, candid construction and cordial co-operation.

I have only to add, that I hope it will ever be with you an animating motive *to be* all which I wish you to be; that this will contribute to my highest happiness both here and hereafter; and that my sun, which is now near the horizon, will set in brightness, though that brightness may be lost in superior splendour, if I leave *you as lights in the world*.

Burns, the Poet's, Views of Religion.

[From Reliques of Robert Burns; collected and published by R. H. Cromek. 8vo. p. 362, 3.]

"Those of either sex, but particularly the female, who are lukewarm in that most important of all things, religion—'O, my soul, come not thou into their secret!' I will lay before you the outline of my belief. He who is our author and preserver, and will one day be our judge, must be, (not for his sake, in the way of duty, but from the native impulse of our hearts,) the object of our reverential awe and grateful adoration: he is almighty and all-bounteous; we are weak and dependent: hence, prayer and every other sort of devotion.—'He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to everlasting life;' consequently, it must be in every one's power to embrace his offer of 'everlasting life;' otherwise he could not, in justice, condemn those who did not. A mind pervaded, actuated and governed by purity, truth and charity, though it does not *merit* heaven, yet is an absolutely necessary pre-requisite, without which heaven can neither be obtained nor enjoyed; and by divine promise, such a mind shall never fail of attaining 'everlasting life;' hence, the impure, the deceiving and the uncharitable, exclude themselves from eternal bliss, by their unfitness for enjoying it. The Supreme Being has put the administration of all this, for wise and good ends known to himself, into the hands of Jesus Christ, a great personage, whose relation to him we cannot comprehend; but whose relation to us is a Guide and Saviour; and who, except for our own obstinacy and misconduct, will bring us all, through various ways and by various means, to bliss at last.

"These are my tenets, my friend. My creed is nearly expressed in the last clause of *Jamie Dean's* grace, an honest weaver in Ayrshire; 'Lord grant that we may lead a gude life! for a gude life makes a gude end, at least it helps weel!'"

GLEANINGS; OR, SELECTIONS AND REFLECTIONS MADE IN A COURSE OF GENERAL READING.

No. CXXXIV.*

A Heathen's View of National Christianity.

Ammianus Marcellinus, a heathen soldier and writer, who flourished A. D. 380, has the following passage in his character of the Emperor Constantius:—"The Christian religion, which in itself is plain and simple, he adulterated with a childish superstition (*anili superstitione*): for studying it with a vain curiosity instead of sober modesty, he raised many dissentions, which when caused he cherished and increased by a strife about words. And the public carriages were even worn out by the troops of priests galloping from all quarters to their synods, as they call them, to bring the whole sect to their particular opinion."

"Most persons," says Lardner, (Works, viii. 467, 468.) "will allow this to be a judicious passage. 1st, He calls the Christian religion 'a plain and simple religion.' They who best understand the N. T. will most admire the justness of this observation. 2ndly, 'The strife about words,' very probably has a reference to those two words, 'homoüsius,' and 'homoioüsius, of the same,' and 'the like substance,' which caused so much disturbance among Christians of the fourth century. 3dly, We plainly see that the Arians rendered themselves ridiculous, and exposed the Christian religion, by the multitude of their synods in this reign. Nor were the Heathen people only, but the Catholicks likewise, concerned for the poor post horses; as appears from a passage of Hilary observed by Valesius, in his notes upon this place of Ammianus. 4thly, The design of these councils was impertinent, namely, to bring all Christians to an agreement in some words and phrases, which were the invention of a vain and eager curiosity; when it was sufficient for Christians to agree in the main things of religion. Lastly, Take away the additions of human invention, and Christians might agree and be of one mind: which is a very desirable thing, and is the command and earnest request of Christ and his apostles; but till that is done, unity is in vain expected, and Christianity will be reproached."

---

* For CXXXIV, p. 455, read CXXXIII.

No. CXXXV.
Boerhaave's Motto.

The motto chosen by this great man was characteristic: *Simplex sigillum veri*: "Simplicity the seal of truth."

No. CXXXVI.
Cottagers.

When Burns, in his better days, walked out in a fine summer morning with Dugald Stewart, and the latter observed to him what a beauty the scattered cottages, with their white walls and curling smoke shining in the silent sun, imparted to the landscape, the peasant poet answered, that *he* felt that beauty ten times more strongly than his companion; and that it was necessary to be a cottager, to know what pure and tranquil pleasures nestled below those lowly roofs, or to read, in their external appearance, the signs of so many heartfelt and long-remembered enjoyments.

No. CXXXVII.
Victims of Persecution.

Them of understanding shall fall, says the prophet Daniel, viii. 35. This Bishop Newton interprets, with reason, of the persecution of Christians, whether by heathens or by one another. *Generally speaking* (he says, Diss. on Proph. ii. 146) '*those of understanding' have fallen a sacrifice to others, some of the best and wisest men to some of the worst and most ignorant. At least, if the persecuted have not been always in the right, yet the persecutors have been always in the wrong.*

No. CXXXVIII.
Reform.

He that looks back to the history of mankind will often see, (says the learned and eloquent *Philopatris Varvicensis*,) that in politics, jurisprudence, religion and all the great concerns of society, Reform has been usually the work of reason, slowly awakening from the lethargy of ignorance, gradually acquiring confidence in her own strength, and ultimately triumphing over the dominion of prejudice and custom.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

Primitivus in Answer to Mr. Jones.

Sir,

Under the signature, *Primitivus,* I took the liberty to send you some remarks on Mr. Wakefield's translation of Acts xx. 28. and on his note justifying the text which he had adopted, and the rendering of that text which he had furnished. The whole appeared to me extraordinary, and had excited my astonishment on every perusal. Dr. Middleton, whom I had not then perused on that passage, had recommended the note to his readers *as amusing*, in a spirit, I believe, far less friendly to the reputation of Gilbert Wakefield, than that which actuated me, who can truly say, that I regard the fame of that eminent scholar only less than the cause of truth.

Mr. Jones has animadverted on my communication with some warmth, which I do not reprehend, as he must be affected by feelings not common to us both. It became the pupil to hold his shield before a tutor, from whose aid he could not fail to derive abundant advantage, and whose friendship he probably enjoyed. To me Mr. Wakefield presented himself as a critic only, and I truly stated my opinion of him in that character, which I still retain, as my remarks remain in their full force, and the translation and note cannot now be cancelled, nor, it seems, defended.

I cannot, however, refrain from feeling regret that it was not possible to speak without disparagement of Mr. W.'s critical skill and judgment, when commenting on his labour on the text in question. What is to be done when a learned man has committed his literary fortune on the ocean of criticism? Must his errors be left unreproved, when they even materially affect the interest of the truth? How long is tenderness to restrain us? How far is the grave, at Mr. Jones's appeal to which I was sensibly affected, a fortress in which important mistakes are to find shelter? I can say truly, that if I could have given my opinion with one grain of severity less than I have employed, if I have employed any, without shewing the truth a less strenuous countenance than I thought its importance deserved, I would gladly have so done. In the mean time, I observe that mercy is demanded with little grace for Mr. Wakefield, who never shewed any, and would, probably have disdained to accept it; and especially when demanded by Mr. Jones, who, I believe, will be allowed, by those who have perused his interesting and very ingenious works, and even his attack on Griesbach, in his answer to my paper, to have handled the dead and the living with no great portion of placidity and favour.

But these personal concerns are of little moment. The subject in discussion is of too great weight to afford them room. I will, therefore, proceed, without further delay, to show the fallacy of Mr. Jones's reasoning, as far as I am concerned, and to offer the reasons which prevent me from feeling the least "regret on revising any part of my article," except as I have already expressed, and except so far as it was hastily composed.

The first observation of Mr. Jones that deserves consideration, and, indeed, the only one which affects me, is, that "*the best defence of Gilbert Wakefield's critical talents will be a refutation of Griesbach.*" On this I might merely clap a *non sequitur.* The inconsequence is apparent. Let it be granted that Griesbach is refuted by Mr. Jones, is that a proof of Mr. Wakefield's skill as a critic? It was incumbent on Mr. Jones to prove not merely that Mr. Wakefield was right and Griesbach wrong, but that the former has supported his cause with skill and judgment, and by good arguments refuted the latter. This he has not attempted, and I admire his prudence. For, the translation and note, which gave rise to this discussion, are dissipated for ever, like the sand of the desart, and it will be out of the power of Mr. Jones to replace them, who may justly adopt the words of Eneas, *Si Pergama dextra defendi possent, etiam hac defensa fuissent.* Primitivus is, therefore, safe from the danger of the recoil of his own severity, if such he has used, whatever may become of Griesbach, against whom he has undesignedly drawn forth the reprehension of Mr. Jones. With me he is no "oracle," as it is groundlessly intimated, and no admiration of him is expressed in my paper, further than by recommending a translation of his very able note on this text, which I, at this time, more strenuously recommend, as the subject now more imperiously requires it; and in this I expect to be supported by even Mr. Jones.

Having now set Primitivus in safety, I might bid adieu to the discussion, as the whole of Mr. Jones's paper, after the first paragraph, is new matter, not *in the record* when I wrote, and scarcely in any degree connected with Mr. W.'s defence. Indeed, the last part of it is a decided condemnation of his client's translation, against which I felt a principal portion of dislike. However, being as ready to defend a person when wrongly condemned, as I am to reprove one that may deserve reproof, I will not shrink from giving such aid to Griesbach as I can legitimately lend him. Though Mr. W. is now given up, and I am in safety, yet I will volunteer in the cause of a distinguished critic, though not my "oracle."

Mr. Jones says, that "the authority of manuscripts is decidedly in favour of the common text," that is of του θεου, in opposition to του κυριου adopted by Griesbach. Here we are at issue, and I venture to deny this position in unqualified terms. Του κυριου is supported by no less names than those of Wetstein, Michaelis and Griesbach. Dr. Middleton, with all the willingness in the world to have του θεου retained, acknowledges, in more than one place of his bulky volume on the Greek article, that the reading of this text is doubtful. From Mr. Jones's statement of the evidence I appeal to the abstract of it in that work, and to Griesbach's note, which I anxiously wish to see given to the public, in your valuable Repository.

Mr. Wakefield, adopting the

reading *του θεου*, could not bring his nerves to endure the abominable sound of the English phrase, *God's own blood;* and escaped, by chaunting, on his own part, a sweeter song, *his own son.*—Mr. Jones also feels with all the acuteness of G. W. the discord of the sound, and has still sweeter notes, by which he drowns the harsh music of the orthodox: so sweet are they that, while they prove, as fully as I have done, Mr. Wakefield's want of skill in this art, they almost persuade me to *listen* to them. But it is sometimes wise to deny attention to Syren songs, for they may prove dangerous.—Dr. Middleton, forced to be doubtful, in which he differs from Mr. Jones, has ears fitted for any sounds, as it would appear; yet, though not shocked at *God's own blood*, he, thinking very truly, that the Father, or the first person of God, has not blood, demurely finds that the second person of God, or, as he calls him, God the Son, had some blood that was actually spilt for mankind, and must be meant by *ὁ θεος*, could that reading stand. In all my life, I had conceived that even Trinitarians allowed that it was the *man* Christ Jesus that shed his blood, and that the *God* Jesus Christ was not passble. At least no more could, I supposed, be predicated of the second person of God, than of the first, as to shedding blood, except that a mysterious union subsisted between the divine and human natures of Jesus Christ, by which an efficacious virtue was given to the blood of the Man, on account of his relation to the God. But that the second person of God, in his divine nature, shed his blood,—and nothing less can be meant, if this text can prove the *divinity* of Christ, for he only that shed his blood has any claim to the title of God, *του θεου*,—this I could not have divined, but by the assistance of Dr. Middleton, who is, indeed, a *Ductor Dubitantium*, for nothing stops him. He hies over brook and over bray, with chivalrous intrepidity, at least on such a subject, and I doubt not of his arriving at *the end at which he is aiming*. Yet, Dr. Middleton must be allowed an impartial reporter of the state of this text, and I must beg leave to refer the reader to him, at least for the present, and till Griesbach's note shall appear in your publication.

I must pause at this place, because I have too much to say to render it convenient either to me to send, or to you to insert, at present, all the animadversions suggested by almost every part of Mr. Jones's paper. When I trouble you again, I shall speak first to the Æthiopic version, and to the *Arabic*, which Mr. Jones has brought in as a witness, though without extracting from it any evidence. I shall afterwards remark on positions that appear to me to be very temerarious; although I by no means intend to give here a syllabus of the contents of the remainder of my communication, but merely to stimulate the curiosity of your readers.

As Mr. Jones has not withholden his name from your readers on this occasion, Primitivus thinks it right to abandon the disguise of his signature, by subscribing himself,

Sir, Yours, &c.

CHARLES LLOYD.

POETRY.

EULOGY TO THE MEMORY OF THAT EXCELLENT MAN AND DISTINGUISHED PHILANTHROPIST, THE LATE GRANVILLE SHARP, ESQ. ADDRESSED TO A FRIEND.

WHY mourns my friend, in sorrow's deepest gloom ;
Why heaves his bosom with such poignant grief?
That matchless merit sinks into the tomb?
Painful to us the change, to him relief.

Shall worth like his into the grave descend,
Without the tribute of one parting lay ;
Shall Sharp ! so long of all mankind the friend,
Unhonour'd leave us, for the realms of day ?

No: every Virtue round thy bier shall weep,
And Britain's sons partake a gen'ral sigh ;
The sable children of the western deep,
Shall join in sorrow, with a widow's cry—

That lost for ever, is that holy flame,
Which nerv'd thy arm, and strung thy pow'rful tongue,
T' impeach Oppression's ever guilty name,
And plead the freeman's rights,—the captive's wrong.

Thy Genius pierced first, the darksome night,
Where groaning Africa despairing lay ;
Her woes, unthought of, met Britannia's sight;
God said, " Let Sharp exist," and all was day.

Nor slept thy arm, through many a conflict dire,
With pallid Avarice it long maintain'd,
Till senates witnessed the consuming fire
Of Truth ; and lust and cruelty were both enchain'd.

Nor *Slavery* shall escape thy deadly blow ;
To Error's reign a loud alarm is giv'n ;
Freedom's the right of ev'ry man below,
Conviction travels like the light of heav'n.

In youth, thy mind enrich'd with learning's page,
Truth for its guide, benevolence its aim,
Prov'd Justice to be Law :* nor Envy's rage,
Could intercept from thee the wreath of fame.

---

* Alluding to the case of Somerset, the Negro, brought by Mr. Sharp before Lord Mansfield, in the Court of King's Bench, in 1772, which trial obtained the important decision, that the moment a slave sets his foot on English ground, he becomes free.

Religion claim'd thee for her meekest son,
  Instilled her precepts, and her doctrines pure,
Though affluent, taught thee ev'ry vice to shun,
  Thy wealth not on thyself bestow, but on the poor.

What num'rous blessings, the distress'd thou'st giv'n;
  What human woes have been assuaged by thee!
A recompence awaits thy soul in heav'n;
  And shines thy crown to all eternity!

Ye! whom the world calls great, mark well his end:
  Heroes or statesmen! can your deeds compare
With Sharp! so long of all mankind the friend;
  Or can you hope a bliss like his to share?

A bliss like his you'll share, if faithful found,
  Nobly pursuing the high road he trod;
Elijah's mantle never reach'd *the ground*,
  Caught by Elisha, from Elijah's God.

Meek, venerable sage! a long farewell!
  Some monumental stone thy deeds may bear,
There pensive Genius shall delight to dwell,
  And mingle with thy honor'd dust, a tear.

ELEGY TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE GOVERNOR DUNCAN, OF BOMBAY.

SHALL laurel wreaths adorn the warrior's brow,
  And venal bards o'er sons of slaughter mourn,—
And not one grateful tear for Duncan flow—
  No cypress wave to shade his sacred urn?

The labour'd monument may proudly rise,
  And dubious fame from dark oblivion save,—
The sculptured stone attract the gazer's eyes,
  And snatch a short-lived triumph o'er the grave:

A nobler meed is due to Duncan's name
  Than brass or marble monuments impart:
The faithful record of his lasting fame
  Shall long be graved on many a grateful heart;

The watchful care—the unremitting zeal—
  The spotless hand that gold could never stain—
The heart whose triumph was the public weal,
  That in diffusing bliss was blest again:

Such was the ruler; would you know the man?
  Go search Benares; trace the Ganges' stream:
Wide o'er the plains of fruitful Indostan,
  His deeds are still the gentle Hindoo's theme.

With pleasure sparkling in their humid eyes,
Fond parents mark a new-born daughter smile;
While grateful prayers are wafted to the skies
For Duncan—honour to his native isle.

Go, hide your heads, ye spoilers of the world,
Whom Avarice leads to India's distant shore!
And you who bearing war's red flag unfurl'd,
With ruthless bosoms bid his thunders roar!

Yet, should the passions that impel your way
Give cool reflection place within your breast,
Haply your feet some secret hour may stray
To that sad spot where Duncan's ashes rest.

But pause;—ere ye approach the hallowed sod,
Renounce and banish every earthly care;
For forms unseen have fix'd their lone abode
And weeping virtues love to linger there.

When glides the pale moon o'er the midnight sky,
Her mellow light reflected from the wave,
On Duncan's urn shall dove-eyed Pity sigh,
And Mercy hover o'er her votary's grave.

Years yet to come shall witness as they roll,
Some chieftain, anxious to discharge his trust,
(While generous ardour animates his soul)
With reverence muse o'er Duncan's sacred dust.

And thou, blest shade, with kind benignant eye
Wilt mark him kneeling at thy hallowed shrine,—
Shalt hear his prayer approach thy native sky—
"A life as pure and fame as fix'd as thine!"

Arbroath. A. B.

"*With pleasure sparkling in their humid eyes, &c.*"

This stanza alludes to Governor Duncan's being the first to move, in putting a stop to the horrid practice of female infanticide among certain casts of Hindoos. The success that attended his laudable efforts in the accomplishment of so beneficent an object, he ever contemplated as one of the happiest incidents of his life.

FROM THE GERMAN OF SCHILLER.

LOVE.

————O how transporting
And sweet it is, within a lovely soul
To feel our sov'reign rule,—it is to know
That our delights tint other cheeks with joy,
That our afflictions heave another's breast,
That other eyes shed tears for our distress.

REVIEW.

"Still pleas'd to praise, yet not afraid to blame.—POPE.

ART. I. *Answer to the Charge delivered by the Lord Bishop of Lincoln, to the Clergy of that Diocese*, at the Triennial Visitation, in the year 1812. By the Rev. John Chetwode Eustace. 4to. pp. 52. 2nd Edit. Mawman. 1813.

Mr. Eustace is a Roman Catholic clergyman, who has presented himself most creditably before the public, in his two volumes of Travels in Italy. He is a scholar, a gentleman and, we scruple not to say, as far as we can judge of his spirit by the pamphlet before us, an exemplary Christian. We wish the Bishop of Lincoln well rid of such an antagonist.

Our object in taking notice of Mr. Eustace's Answer, is not to go into the Catholic Question, but merely to present the reader with a few passages from the fine pen of this Catholic writer, as happy *signs of the times*.

"As long as the profession of any particular opinion is *punished* by any loss, forfeiture or disability, they who hold that opinion cannot surely be said to be in possession of *perfect* toleration. Your lordship is aware that privations act as fines, and that, whether you compel a Dissenter to pay a certain sum, for the permission of exercising his worship, or exclude him from lucrative offices, in consequence of exercising that worship, the result, with respect to his fortune, is the same. That only is perfect to which nothing can be added, and as long as one single penal law stands unrepealed, so long toleration remains imperfect." p. 9.

"Whoever believes in the gospel acts against his faith, if he violate even the hair of his neighbour's head in religious debate," p. 11.

"Your lordship, however, and every man of observation is aware, that if any British monarch should ever, hereafter, conceive a secret design of undermining the church, he will find, without applying to his Catholic subjects, a sufficient number of Protestant counsellors to aid and further his projects. Courts have at all times abounded in flatterers; and be the monarch's plans ever so absurd or ever so mischievous, he will easily discover, if not among his ministers, at least among his *friends*, some faithful, obsequious, servant, to carry them into execution." p. 17.

"The two Scotch rebellions were the deeds of a powerful Protestant party, arrayed in support of a royal exile, whom, though a Catholic, they deemed their lawful sovereign. They were not enlightened patriots, I admit; but they were generous and loyal subjects, who fought and died for a cause which they held *sacred*; and I strongly suspect that most sovereigns, those of the Brunswick line not excepted, would prefer *their* blind attachment to *our* legal allegiance." pp. 22, 23.

"No animal will bear a yoke that galls; he will kick and toss his head, till he shakes it off, or he will turn against the hand that imposes it. Englishmen and Irishmen form, I presume, no exception to this general rule." p. 26.

———"it is very immaterial to the believer, whether a church *be* infallible, or *act* as if it were infallible. *What is the difference*, we may ask with Steele, *between a church that never can, and a church that never does, err?* Submission is equally the consequence in both cases. The Dissenter will smile at the distinction, my lord.

"Ambigitur quid enim!
Brundusium Numici melius via ducat
an Appî?" p. 41.

"Catholics, my Lord, *believe* that your doctrines are *heretical*; you *swear* that Catholic doctrines are *idolatrous*." p. 47.

"After all, my lord, faith, with all its high prerogatives, is yet subservient to Charity; and we transgress, instead of fulfilling the duties of a Christian, if, in defending the interests of the former, we violate the more important duties of the latter." p. 51.

The remarks on the memorable decree of the fourth Council of Lateran, (pp. 41—43) are well entitled to attention: Mr. Eustace is less convincing in his attempt (pp. 46, 47) to shew that the Catholic church is not illiberal in her sentence on heretics, since she holds heresy to be not error merely, but *obstinate* error. Alas! He that differs in opinion from me is in error, and he that will not yield his opinion to mine, when summoned so to do, is obstinate.

ART. II. *Reflections on Materialism, Immaterialism, the Sleep of the Soul, an Intermediate State, and the Resurrection of the Body:* Being an attempt to prove that the Resurrection commences at Death. By John Platts. 8vo. pp. 40. Sherwood and Co.

The hypothesis of the resurrection being successive and immediately consequent upon death, was, we believe, first maintained in this country by Dr. Caleb Fleming, in his "Survey of the Search after Souls," an 8vo. volume, published in the year 1758. "An attempt to prove" the same hypothesis, was made in an Essay in the "Theological Repository," edited by Dr. Priestley, (vol. ii. p. 350—399,) to which there is the signature of *Philander*.* And there is an able and learned defence of the same scheme, in the late Rev. Newcome Cappe's "Critical Remarks," Dissertation *On the Future Life of Man*, vol. II. p. 271—380. The subject was brought into discussion in our Sixth Volume, by the present author, whose letters in the *Monthly Repository*, [vi. 407, 454, 598] are indeed the basis of his pamphlet.

Mr. Platts argues the point in hand philosophically and scripturally. We suspect that philosophical materialists will not allow that he has correctly stated their proposition and arguments, and scriptural materialists have texts and expositions of texts which he has not noticed.

In a note, (p. 16,) Mr. Platts wonders at some theologians, not mentioned, but we apprehend that his admiration arises from his mistaking their notion. No one surely could have seriously maintained that our Lord's reply to the malefactor on the cross, intended only, that he should that day be buried in a garden; but there is some reason for supposing that it signified no more than that the sufferer should be in the place and state of the righteous dead. "*Paradisus*—apud Judæos vocatur locus amœnus, qui recipit animas piorum mortuorum, ibi mansuras, donec iterum corporibus jungantur, qui locus Græcis camporum Elysiorum nomine venit (*Joseph.* de B. J. III. 8. 5.) quæ fuit Josephi et Pharisæorum sententia." Rosenmulleri (D. J. G.) Scholia in Luc.

---

* In the reviewer's copy of the *Theolog. Repos.* is the following MS. note to the signature of *Philander*, in the Table of Contents,—"This curious piece on the resurrection was communicated by a gentleman of the North of Ireland, to Archdeacon Blackburne, from whom an answer to it was expected, if the Theological Repository had been continued.—Monthly Review for May, 1776. Correspondence."

xxiii. 43. When Mr. Platts says *Πὰραδεισος* (*Paradise*) "*never* means a garden in the New Testament," he must have overlooked Rev. ii. 7, one of the three only places in which the word occurs.

But although we do not feel the force of all Mr. Platts's arguments, we can honestly recommend his pamphlet to such as wish to catch every gleam of light on the awful and mysterious subject of future existence.

ART III. *Brief Remarks on the State of Man, and his Redemption by Jesus Christ.* By George Stacey, 8vo. pp. 29. Phillips. 1812.

This little tract exhibits, we believe, a fair specimen of the theology of the *orthodox* Quakers. The author reasons well against original sin, but maintains the depravity of the human mind, and its consequent unfitness to judge of the high mysteries of the Trinity, and its kindred doctrines. Reason being set aside, what is the judge? Hear Friend Stacey: "faith, *or feeling*, gives to the submissive mind, evidence of the union of Father, Son and Holy Spirit!" (pp. 17, 18.) This good friend puts it forward as an argument for the Divinity of Christ, that "the Father and the Son are alike designated *Light*" (p. 16): John the Baptist is denominated by our Lord, "a burning and a shining light," and, therefore, by Friend Stacy's logic, it might be proved that the Baptist is, at least, equal to God the Father.

Out of the mystic circle of system, Friend Stacey writes intelligibly and argues sensibly: we recommend to him two short sentences of his own,—

"Christianity gives no countenance to intellectual supineness. It calls alike for the surrender of the will, and the dedication and exercise of the faculties; nor are we less accountable for declining the improvement of the talents committed to our care, than for their misapplication." p. 28.

ART. IV. *Belsham's Memoirs of the Rev. Theophilus Lindsey, M. A.* &c.

(Continued from p. 342.)

Mr. Lindsey's "Apology" was attacked by Mr. Burgh, of York, Mr. Bingham, of Dorsetshire, and Dr. Randolph, of Oxford, and in 1776, the author stood forward in its defence, in his "Sequel," the most elaborate of all his publications, and that, perhaps, which has best served the cause of Unitarianism. The works of Burgh and Randolph were answered also by Mr. Temple, a clergyman of Richmond, in Yorkshire, who not agreeing, however, with Mr. Lindsey, in his interpretation of the proem to John's Gospel, and on the subject of religious addresses to Jesus Christ, published his objections, in two pamphlets, which gave rise, in the year 1779, to Mr. Lindsey's "Two Dissertations," intended to prove that the Logos is not Christ, but the word, wisdom and power of God, and that religious worship is not due to Christ, but to God only. To this work there is a postscript by Dr. Jebb, declaring his assent to the arguments of his friend, the author.

The chapel in Essex Street was erected in 1778, and opened March 29th, of that year, when Mr. Lindsey delivered a Discourse upon the Unity of God, and the Spirituality of Divine Worship, which, with the Prayers before and after the Sermon, was immediately published. Amongst other contributors to the new building, Mr. Belsham has recorded the name of Mr. Tayleur, of Shrewsbury, who subscribed for this purpose 500*l*. in the 3 per cent. stock. Of this zealous and liberal friend to truth, an interesting account is subjoined. (pp. 139—141.)

Rightly considering himself as 'set for the defence of the gospel,' Mr. Lindsey published, in 1781, his "Catechist," a small tract, in the form of a dialogue, on the Unity and sole worship of God. The title was ill chosen, and the work did not come to a second edition, until adopted into the Catalogue of the London Unitarian Book Society. It was written, however, with more than Mr. Lindsey's usual spirit. The biographer has extracted a passage (p. 153, 154), apparently with approbation, which seems even acrimonious, and which we know has given serious offence to many candid and inquiring Trinitarians: the passage alluded to, is that in which the believers in two natures in Christ, are described as persons not to be reasoned with, but to be "pitied, as being under a debility of mind in this repect, however sensible and rational in all others." Is not this in the worst spirit of reputed orthodoxy?

The *Catechist* is the only work of Mr. Lindsey's which is not in the 8vo. form. It is worthy of the inquiry of the Book Society, whether it would not be useful to reprint it in this size, to enable his numerous readers to possess a uniform set of his works? This is the more deserving of attention, as the Tract is now scarce.

It is a singular proof of Mr. Lindsey's disinterested zeal on behalf of true religion, that although he was by no means rich, and the income from his chapel was not large, he entertained and expressed an early wish for an assistant in the ministry. He first thought to unite Dr. Jebb with himself in his pastoral duties, but the Dr. chose the profession of medicine. Overtures to the same purpose were made to other seceding clergymen, without effect. At length, in the year 1782, Dr. Disney, the rector of Panton and vicar of Swinderby, Lincolnshire, resigned his livings on the ground of Unitarianism, (See "Reasons for resigning," &c.) and became the associate of the minister of Essex Street,—a connection the more agreeable to both, as they were friends and relations, Dr. Disney having married the daughter of Archdeacon Blackburne. The two eminent confessors of Unitarianism continued happily and honourably connected, until Mr. Lindsey's resignation of the pastoral office in 1793; from that time to the year 1805, Dr. Disney was the sole pastor of the congregation.

His obtaining an assistant in the ministry set Mr. Lindsey more at liberty for defending and promoting Christian truth, by means of the press; and an immediate fruit of his well-employed leisure was, his "Historical View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship," (published in 1783,) an 8vo. volume of considerable interest, but scarcely entitled to be considered, as pronounced by the biographer, (p. 158) "an elaborate work." It is a work of much the same character as Archdeacon Blackburne's "Historical View of the Controversy concerning the Intermediate State." We have (pp. 163, 164) a letter from Dr. Law, the late Bishop of Carlisle, to Mr. Lindsey, in acknowledgment of the receipt of this volume, in which he desires Mr. L. to accept in return a new Cumberland edition of his "*Theory purged of some Antient Prejudices relative to Pre-existence, &c.*"

Mr. Lindsey took an active part in the institution and the proceedings of a Society, which is known to the theological world, by its two volumes of Contributions to Biblical Criticism: the account of this useful association we shall give in the words of Mr. Belsham:

"In September 1783, a society was instituted 'for promoting the knowledge of the scriptures.' The meetings were held at Essex-house. Among the original members of the society were Mr. Lindsey, Dr. Disney, who accepted the office of secretary, Dr. Jebb, Dr. Kippis, Dr. Price, Dr. Calder, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Lee, &c. in London; and in the country, Mr. Tayleur of Shrewsbury, who generously remitted 100*l.* to the society for immediate use, and entered himself as a subscriber of five guineas annually; Mr. Shore and Mr. Newton of Norton, Mr. Turner, Dr. Priestley, Dr. Toulmin, Dr Law, bishop of Carlisle, and others, in all about thirty or forty members. The society limited its object to the illustration of the scriptures, and declined all tracts which were wholly controversial, or which were formal defences or confutations of specific doctrines. A very able sketch of the society's plan was drawn up by Dr. Jebb, in which he states and illustrates what he calls the *analytic* plan of interpretation which the society proposed to pursue and to recommend, viz. Having selected a passage of scripture for the purpose of illustration, to begin with discussing preliminary questions relating to the connection, &c. These being settled, the judicious interpreter is to proceed, by settling the text; by a comparison of various readings; by accurate translation, division and punctuation; by a concise, well-digested commentary; by notes philological and explanatory; and finally, by adding doctrinal and moral conclusions. This, which is unquestionably a most excellent plan of interpretation, was laid down as a general rule, without meaning to require from their correspondents a rigid conformity to it, or to any other specific model; but to admit any communication which tended to the advancement of scriptural knowledge.

"This society did not flourish in the degree nor to the extent of the desires and expectations of its learned and benevolent founders. Its members were never numerous, and they were very sparing in their contributions: the plan was too circumscribed, and interfered too much with the larger, the more comprehensive, and more useful plan of the Theological Repository, at that time resumed by Dr. Priestley: and after languishing a few years, it was altogether given up. Not however, without bequeathing a valuable legacy to the theological student, consisting of two volumes of Commentaries and Essays. Among these are a curious dissertation of Mr. Lindsey's upon John xiv. 1—3; and a gleaning of remarks on Mr. Travis's attempt to revive the exploded text of 1 John v. 7. A translation and notes, by Mr. Dodson, on the twelve first chapters of Isaiah, and likewise upon the fifty-second and fifty third chapters, which were all afterwards republished by that learned writer in a complete translation of the whole book, with notes. Another communication was added by Mr. Dodson in the second volume, in the form of a letter to Mr. Evanson, in defence of his hypothesis concerning the spuriousness of the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and John. Also, two inestimable dissertations of the Rev. Robert Tyrwhitt, one upon the 'Creation of all things by Jesus Christ,' and the other upon the 'Resurrection of the Dead through the Man Jesus Christ.' The bulk of the second volume is made up of remarks, many of them very ingenious, upon select passages in the Old Testament, by the late Rev. Henry More, of Leskiard in Cornwall."

The late Mr. Robinson's well known "Plea for the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ," in which the arguments of Mr. Lindsey's former publications are attacked, made its appearance in 1776; and, considering the candour of the writer, the shewiness of his mode of reasoning, the popularity of his tract, and his great respectability, it may excite our surprize that Mr. L., whose pen was in so many instances ready for controversy, should have taken no notice of it, till after many years. and that at last (1785) he should have published his "Examination" of the Plea anonymously. No two writers could be more unlike than the author of the Plea and the author of the Examination; the one characterized by simplicity, almost childlike, and by plain solid sense, the other by wit and eloquence; and it is probable that Mr. Robinson's work impressed Mr. Lindsey with sentiments very different from respect for the man, and hence, it may be concluded, sprung that "bitter and contemptuous spirit" of the Examiner, of which Mr. R. not wholly without reason complains. But it is not wonderful that Mr. L. should think lightly of the effort of his antagonist, which was not, we believe, entirely satisfactory to Mr. Robinson's Trinitarian friends, and which, after a time, ceased to satisfy himself. Into this ingenious and excellent man's last sentiments, which Mr. Belsham endeavours to ascertain, (pp. 191—196) we shall not enquire; it is sufficiently plain from the *scene* of his death, that, at the close of his life he was not remote in judgment and affection from the Unitarians.

Impelled both by friendship and religious zeal, Mr. Lindsey came forward in 1786, in defence of Dr. Priestley, whom he saw persons, that were incapable of answering his arguments, treating with affected contempt. He entitled his defence "Vindiciæ Priestleianæ, an Address to the Students at Oxford and Cambridge," &c. and the piece was well adapted by its kind spirit and by its miscellaneous information, to take hold of the ingenuous, inquisitive minds of youth. In this work, however, some expressions escaped the author relating to Dr. Price, which were inconsistent with his usual candour: Dr. Price remonstrated with becoming spirit, and Mr. Lindsey apologized with Christian meekness and frankness: the letters that passed on this occasion, (pp. 206—209) are highly honourable to the character of these two eminent men.—And Mr. Lindsey followed up his private concessions by a public retractation of the objectionable words, in his "Second Address." This which was published in the year 1790, "related to Jesus Christ, and the Origin of the great Errors concerning him," which are traced up to Justin Martyr, "the first person who ascribed divinity to Christ." Here appeared first, the "Catalogue of False Readings and Mistranslations," afterwards republished in a separate pamphlet.

Mr. Belsham's analysis of the "Second Address," is interspersed with some curious information concerning Dr. Watts's last religious opinions; as this part of the Memoirs has given birth to a pamphlet, by Mr. Palmer,* we shall extract the whole.—

"In the First Part of this Second Address to the Youth of the two Universities, Mr. Lindsey introduces some curious and affecting passages from Dr. Watts's "Solemn Address to the great and ever-blessed God, on a review of what he had written in the Trinitarian Controversy." It is well known that this learned and pious writer, (who paid

---

[*] "Dr. Watts no Socinian."

very great attention to this important question,) in the latter part of his life receded very far from those mystical opinions concerning the doctrine of the Trinity, and particularly the person of Christ, which he held in his youth. His well known volume of Hymns and Spiritual Songs, so much used in Calvinistic congregations, was published when he was very young, and contains many expressions and many sentiments from which, though regarded by great numbers as the standard of Christian verity, his judgment revolted in maturer years, and which he would gladly have altered if he had been permitted by the proprietors of the copyright, who knew their own interest too well to admit the proposed improvements.

"His sentiments concerning the person of Christ were believed by many to approximate very nearly to those of the old Socinians. But it is not certain that Dr. Watts ever regarded himself as a Socinian.

"On the contrary, there can be little doubt that owing to early prejudice, he would to the latest day of his life have started from the imputation with horror. How nearly soever his opinions might really approach to the Socinian scheme, possibly he himself apprehended that he still kept at an inaccessible distance from them, (it) by contending for a mystical personal union by which a true and proper deity was communicated to the human nature of Christ. Absurd as this supposition is in itself, and as it must be viewed by all unprejudiced minds, it did not appear in that light to Dr. Watts, nor to many others who, influenced by his authority, have since embraced the same strange hypothesis. He and they were serious believers in this modern notion, and have thought that they have discovered in it a salvo for their falling orthodoxy. And they have no doubt as good a right as others to retain and to defend their own system. Dr. Watts's latest opinions concerning the Trinity are supposed to have been contained in some papers prepared for the press, which were left to the discretion of Dr. Jennings and Dr. Doddridge, and which were committed to the flames, (very much as the author of this Memoir has been credibly informed, against the judgment and inclination of the latter,) probably because it was suspected that they would give offence to the zealots of orthodoxy. At any rate, Dr. Watts's last sentiments concerning the person of Christ cannot, perhaps, now, be absolutely ascertained; but the feelings of his humble, pious and inquisitive mind are beautifully exhibited in that devout Address to the Deity, from which Mr. Lindsey has made some copious extracts, of which the following are an interesting specimen:

"'Hadst thou informed me, gracious Father, in any place of thy word, that this divine doctrine is not to be understood by men, and yet they were required to believe it, I would have subdued all my curiosity to faith. But I cannot find thou hast any where forbid me to understand it, or make these inquiries. I have, therefore, been long searching into this divine doctrine, that I may pay thee due honour with understanding. Surely I ought to know the God whom I worship, whether he be one pure and simple being, or whether thou art a threefold deity, consisting of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.'

"'Thou hast called the poor and the ignorant, the mean and foolish things of this world, to the knowledge of thyself and thy Son. But how can such weak creatures ever take in so strange, so difficult, and so abstruse a doctrine as this, in the explication and defence whereof, multitudes of men, even men of learning and piety, have lost themselves in infinite subtilties of disputes and endless mazes of darkness? And can this strange and perplexing notion of three real persons going to make up one true God be so necessary and so important a part of that Christian doctrine which, in the Old Testament and the New, is represented as so plain and easy even to the meanest understandings?'"*

The following extract from a letter written by the late Reverend and learned Samuel Merivale, of Exeter, to Dr. Priestley at Leeds, exhibits the most authentic account of Dr. Watts's last sentiments concerning the Person of Christ: from which it appears that, in Dr. Lardner's estimation, Dr. Watts became in the strict and proper sense of the word an Unitarian.

---

* See Mr. Lindsey's Second Address, p. 5, 6. The extracts are taken from a work published in 1785, entitled "The Life of the Rev. Isaac Watts, D. D. by Samuel Johnson, L L.D. with Notes, containing Animadversions and Additions."

"'What I mentioned to Mr. Aikin,' (the late Rev. Dr. Aikin, Professor of Divinity at Warrington,) 'concerning Dr. Watts, I had from Dr Lardner, who told it me as a thing known to few, though without enjoining me secrecy. Having mentioned in the course of my correspondence with the latter the difficulty of fixing my sentiments with regard to the person of Christ, though I had formerly thought the doctrine of his pre-existence sufficiently proved by Dr. Clarke, Dr. Watts, and others, he replies, 'I think Dr. Watts never was an Arian, to his honour be it spoken. When he first wrote of the Trinity, I reckoned (*reckon*) he believed three equal divine persons. But in the latter part of his life, for several years before his death, and before he was seized with an imbecility of his faculties, he was an *Unitarian*. How he came to be so I cannot certainly say, but I think it was the result of his own meditations on the Scriptures. He was very desirous to promote that opinion, and wrote a great deal upon the subject. But his papers fell into good hands, (meaning Mr. Neal's,) and they did not think them fit for publication. I also saw some of them."'

"'As there seemed some ambiguity in the word *Unitarian*, though I knew very well in how strict a sense the Doctor generally used it, and being aware that Dr. Watts in his later publications quite gave up the notion of a three-fold Deity, though he contended earnestly for the pre-existence of Christ's human soul, originally possessed of powers super-angelical, on which however he is silent in his Solemn Address to the Deity, printed in the quarto edition of his works, I begged leave to be informed, whether in his unpublished papers he had appeared to have given up that point; in answer to which Dr. Lardner wrote:

"'I question whether you have any where in print Dr. Watts's last Thoughts upon the Trinity. They were known to very few. My nephew Neal, an understanding gentleman, was intimate with Dr. Watts, and often with the family where he lived. Sometimes in an evening when they were alone, he would talk to his friends in the family of his new thoughts concerning the person of Christ, and their great importance: and that, if he should be able to recommend them to the world, it would be the most considerable thing that ever he performed. My nephew, therefore, came to me and told me of it, and that the family was greatly concerned to hear him talk so much of the importance of these sentiments. I told my nephew that Dr. Watts was in the right in saying they were important, but I was of opinion that he was unable to recommend them to the public, because he had never been used to a proper way of reasoning on such a subject. So it proved. My nephew being executor, had the papers, and showed me some of them. Dr. Watts had written a good deal, but they were not fit to be published. DR. WATTS'S LAST THOUGHTS WERE COMPLETELY UNITARIAN.'

"One cannot help regretting that such should have been the judgment of Dr. Lardner, and such the decision of the executors with respect to the publication of Dr. Watts's last essays upon a subject on which he had thought and written so much. The judgment of Dr. Doddridge, one of the trustees for Dr. Watts's papers, himself a professed Trinitarian, but a lover of truth and a friend to inquiry, was, as I have mentioned above, very different, and, as many think, more correct. How interesting and instructive would it have been to have traced the mind of this great and good man through the various steps of his progress from the darkest shades of error to the clear light of rational and evangelical truth!" pp 216—221.

[*To be continued.*]

INTELLIGENCE.

Opening of a Place for Unitarian Worship, at Oldham.

On Sunday, May 23rd, a large and convenient room was opened for Unitarian worship, at Oldham, near Manchester. Two excellent sermons were preached on the occasion, to a congregation of nearly 200 serious and attentive hearers, by Rev. J. Brookes, of Hide, in lieu of Rev. J. Grundy, who, on account of his late sickness, was incapable of preaching. The first, in the morning from 1 John, iv. 8.; the second in the afternoon, from Deut. vi. 4. They contained a strong and animated defence of the strict Unity and placability of God. It will, no doubt, be at once pleasing and encouraging to the Friends and subscribers of the Unitarian Fund, to be informed that Mr. Wright's late visit into this county, has been the *immediate* cause of the present flourishing appearance of Unitarianism in Oldham. It will be seen by his report, that there have been a few Unitarians for some time, in this place, and soon after his departure, they established a regular weekly meeting for social worship, at one of their own houses. They were sensible, that unless they could procure preaching, they could never rouse the attention of their fellow townsmen; and as they were unable to procure the assistance of regular ministers, three of their own members agreed to preach in turn: by so doing, aided by the distribution of a few tracts, they soon found their meetings so crowded, as to render it necessary to procure a larger place to meet in. With the assistance of several gentlemen, warm friends to the cause, in and about Manchester, they were enabled to hire and furnish their present room. They are likely to be well supplied with preaching; their meetings are conducted on a popular plan; they have attracted the attention of the town, they unite the zeal of Methodists, to the information and liberality of Unitarians so that there is no doubt but that the knowledge of the *Only True God* will spread rapidly in the place and its neighbourhood, and soon obtain a permanent establishment.

June 23. B. G.

Anniversary Meeting of the Southern Unitarian Society.

The ANNIVERSARY MEETING of the SOUTHERN UNITARIAN SOCIETY, took place at BRIGHTON, on Wednesday, June 30th. It was very well attended, by persons attached to the cause from the neighbouring places, as well as by many members residing at a distance. The sermon in the morning was preached by the Rev. W. J. Fox, of Chichester, on the merits of which, as it will be printed, it is unnecessary here to enlarge. The Rev. Mr. Morris, of Lewis, in the evening, addressed the congregation from "Let the same mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus."

The members of the Society, with other friends to the cause, dined together; after which, the Rev. Mr. Bennett gave an interesting account of the progress of Unitarianism at Brighton, and of the difficulties which its advocates had had to contend with, which, "by a patient continuance in well doing," they had in a great measure overcome. The company present appeared gratified at the recollection that there is *now* at *Brighton*, a house of prayer, devoted to the one living and true God; and hope pictured to them the happy era, when there, as in all the earth beside, *Christian* idolatry, to say nothing of Pagan, would no more be known.

Among other appropriate toasts, the health of Mr. Bennett and Mr. Vine, who had so much contributed to fan the flame of Unitarianism in Sussex, was drank with applause, as was that of William Smith, Esq. the Rev. Thomas Rees, and the Rev. John Evans,—with an expressed hope that the former would be successful in his efforts to gain *legal security* for Unitarians, in the profession of their sentiments, and that the two latter will continue to prove themselves, as of late they have publicly done, the firm friends to religious liberty, and the watchful guardians of the rights of Dissenters from the Established Church.

Of the next place of meeting, which was not definitively fixed, due notice will be given. J. F.

Newport Isle of Wight,
July 5th, 1813.

Warwickshire Unitarian Tract Society.

The ANNUAL MEETING of the UNITARIAN TRACT SOCIETY, established in Birmingham, for Warwickshire and the neighbouring counties, was holden at Hinckley, in Leicestershire, on Wednesday, July 7th. The devotional service, in the morning, was conducted by the Rev. John Kentish, and the Rev. James Tayler delivered a discourse, which was evidently heard with great attention and interest, from Romans x. ii. "For I bear them record, that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge." The objects of the sermon were, 1st. to explain what is meant by a zeal of God; 2ndly, to point out when that zeal may be affirmed to be not according to knowledge; and 3dly, to state the motives to a zeal of God, which *is* according to knowledge. It is unnecessary to enter at large into the various arguments and illustrations employed under each of these heads, because Mr. Tayler has kindly consented to furnish the Society with a copy of the discourse for publication.

After the usual business of the Society had been transacted, about forty gentlemen, members and friends of the Society, dined together. The following were the principal sentiments given from the chair:—1. The Unitarian Tract Society, established in Birmingham, for Warwickshire and the neighbouring counties. 2. The Unitarian Book Societies throughout the kingdom. 3. The Unitarian Fund and Academy. 4. The Manchester New College, removed to York, its patrons, trustees, tutors and students. Here the Rev. John Kentish, in an eloquent and interesting speech, pointed out the claims of the academical institution at York, upon the patronage of all who wish well to the cause of Christian truth and virtue, and congratulated the company on the great and increasing spread of Unitarianism not only in England, but in Scotland and America. "Even Scotland," said Mr. Kentish, "has been startled at the sight of an Unitarian church rising up in the bosom of her Calvinistic establishment; and the seeds which were scattered by the storm of persecution, beyond the waves of the Atlantic, already give the promise of a rich and abundant harvest." 5. May no weapons be employed in defence of truth, but reason and argument. 6. The health of William Smith, Esq M. P and success to his efforts for abolishing the penal laws against Anti-trinitarians — 7. Success to every legal measure, for the repeal of disabling statutes in matters of religion.

In the evening, the Rev. George Kenrick, (the youngest son of that exemplary and lamented Christian, the Rev Timothy Kenrick, of Exeter,) conducted the devotional service; and the Rev John Kentish delivered an excellent discourse from Ephesians ii. 8. "By grace ye are saved, through faith: and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God."—The connection of the text was pointed out: the strong and distinct terms in which the apostle represents the Christian scheme as originating with God, as flowing from the riches of his mercy, were particularly insisted on. It was then proposed in the 1st place, to explain the import of the words *grace* and *faith*; 2dly, to illustrate and confirm the doctrine here stated by Paul; and 3dly, to recommend the temper and conduct which a belief of this truth ought in reason to produce.

Ten Dissenting ministers were present at the Meeting; the Rev. J. Bull Bristowe, of Hinckley, J. H. Bransby, of Dudley, Timothy Davis of Coventry, Timothy Davis, of Oldbury, J. Grundy, of Manchester, J. Kenrick, of York, G. Kenrick, of Chesterfield, J. Kentish, of Birmingham, J. Owen, of Loughborough, and J. Tayler, of Nottingham.

Since the last Annual Meeting of this Society, the list of its members has received an addition of twenty-four names.

J. H. B.

General Association of the Unitarians of Scotland.

The Unitarians of Scotland having long and deeply felt the want of greater union with each other, have lately established Funds, in different parts of Scotland, to support a General Annual Association of all the Societies in that division of the kingdom, which are agreed in the belief of the strict Unity of God.

On Wednesday, July 28th, 1813, was held in Edinburgh, at the Skinners' Hall chapel, the first General Association on this plan. It was an important day. It will prove, we trust an era in the history of Unitarianism in Scotland.

The meeting was most auspicious, and if followed up by the same ability, zeal, and harmony, it must result in consequences the most happy to religion and to society.

Mr. G. Harris, of Maidstone, conducted the devotional part of the service, the Rev. T. S. Smith, the Unitarian minister of Edinburgh, delivered an address, explaining the nature and objects of the Institution, and the Rev. James Yates, of Glasgow, a sermon, explaining the nature, manner and extent of gospel salvation, from Acts xiii. 47, "I have set thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation to the ends of the earth."

After the service, the address and sermon were unanimously and earnestly requested to be printed; and the following resolutions, constituting the Society, were unanimously agreed to.

Resolved,

1st. That this Society be denominated the Scotch Unitarian Association.

2nd. That the objects of this institution be, 1st, to promote and keep up an intercourse and correspondence between the different Societies in Scotland, which are united upon the common principles of the strict Unity of God, and of his universal love to his creatures. 2nd, To support public worship, by giving assistance to those Societies of Unitarian Christians in Scotland, who may be in need of it. 3d, To assist in defraying the expences of Unitarian missionaries in Scotland, and, 4th, To contribute to the illustration and establishment of the doctrines and spirit of Christianity, by the distribution of tracts.

3d. That while the members of this Association disdain to shrink from the avowal of whatever they believe to be true, they will at all times endeavour to banish prejudice by a spirit of candour, and to destroy the effects of misrepresentation, by a character and conduct which shall be free from stain or reproach.

4th. That being stigmatized by the title of Deists, they make their open and most solemn appeal to the writings of the Old and New Testaments, in support of the great principles they avow and maintain.

5th. That with a view to carry into effect the objects of the Association, as specified above, the different Funds, established to support the Association, be requested to transmit to it a sum annually, according to their respective resources, to be placed at the disposal of the Association.

6th. That every member of any Fund connected with the Association, shall be considered a member of the Association, and his presence at it shall entitle him to vote.

7th. That each Fund be requested to send three delegates to the General Association, one of whom may be a minister.

8th. That corresponding members be appointed in every place, where there are Unitarians, and that they be requested to send an annual account of the state and progress of Unitarianism in their respective neighbourhoods, to the Secretary of the Association, in order that he may lay it before the General Meeting.

9th That the management of the affairs of the Institution, be vested in nine Directors, from whom shall be chosen the Treasurer and Secretary.

10th. That the Committee shall be chosen annually from the place where the last Association was held.

11th. That the Committee for the ensuing year, shall consist of the following gentlemen, in Edinburgh:

James Fortune, Lamont Scott, William Scott, David Moncur, Robert Cumming, William Phillip, William M'Minn, James Morison, Treasurer, T. S. Smith, Secretary.

12th. That every question, which shall come before the Association, shall be determined by a majority of votes.

The following vote of thanks to that able, indefatigable and successful advocate of civil and religious liberty, William Smith, Esq. M. P. was proposed, and carried unanimously, and the Secretary ordered to communicate it in the name of the Association. Resolved, that this Meeting regard, with warm sensations of gratitude, the exertions of William Smith, Esq. M. P. to procure the repeal of all those disgraceful statutes in the codes of the United Kingdoms, which affected the security and honour of the Unitarian body; rejoicing that the approbation due to those exertions, even if they had failed, is heightened by the sentiment of ardent congratulation, on account of their complete success, and hoping that the increasing liberality of the age, which has annihilated the violent spirit of opposition so lately in full force against a similar measure, may speedily effect the total removal of all legal restraints upon the free and independent exercise of the understanding in matters of religion.

At this Meeting, Delegates were present from Glasgow, Dundee, Paisley, &c. and the following communications respecting the state and progress of Unitarianism in Scotland, were received from the undermentioned places. (The passages within commas are extracts.)

At *Glasgow* the church under the pastoral care of the Rev. J. Yates, whose learning and talents are admired by all, and excelled by few, is in a very flourishing condition. Mr. Yates has established a course of monthly evening lectures on the doctrine of the Unity of God, which are very numerously and respectably attended. There is hardly a town in the world, we suppose, where there is so much attention paid to concerns of a religious nature, particularly at the present time; and we look with confidence to the happy results which must flow from this state of the public mind. The attendants at the church in Glasgow are seldom below, and generally exceed, four hundred. The society has lately purchased a very handsome organ, which adds much to the beauty of the place.

At *Port Glasgow*, the cause of pure unadulterated Christianity "is making progress slowly, but, I may confidently add, surely, and in a very little time its progress will be conspicuous."

At *Greenock* "there are hundreds of this belief in secret confession, and I am almost certain, if a place of meeting for a Unitarian church were opened in Greenock, though but once a month, many members would be found to attend, countenance and join in brotherhood."

At *Paisley*, the regular attendants are between sixty and seventy. The friends here are, in general, men of very considerable talents, learning and respectability. Several members of the church regularly preach to the society, and they are occasionally assisted by one or two of the English students from the University of Glasgow, and by a zealous friend, a member of the Glasgow church.

At *Dalry* there are a few friends who profess the principles of Unitarianism openly, and there are many who believe it secretly. It is not long since Unitarianism was known in this place, and considering the time its progress has been great.

At *Hamilton*, many are convinced, but are not at present inclined to avow their sentiments, owing to the general odium most unjustly attached to these views of religion. Mr Campbell preached here in his recent tour in Scotland, and gave general satisfaction to those who heard him.

At *Kilwinning*, "owing to the decease of some of the most zealous friends of the cause, and the removal of others to distant places, there now remain not more than three or four, who can be said to be avowed Unitarians. Though we are few in number, yet the cause of Unitarianism is gaining ground by slow degrees. Those of us who have avowed these sentiments have been pretty active in distributing and circulating tracts, which have been more productive than any other means."

At *Carluke*, "those who are decided Unitarians are about twenty. Twice that number may be termed Semi-Unitarians, and a much greater number are disposed to inquire, and willing to hear. To preserve and improve this spirit of inquiry, the missions should be more frequent. A stated missionary sermon, once a month, would be of essential service. Amongst us many are prevented from declaring their sentiments, lest they should be put out of the synagogue, whilst no Unitarian assylum is open for their reception. In this and many other places, the fields are whitening to the harvest, and we earnestly pray that more labourers might be sent forth into it."

At *Lanark*, "since Mr. Lyons first preached here, a most wonderful change has taken place in the minds of men, both in the town and its neighbourhood; but we are still far behind, and stand in great need of information, and for this purpose I would recommend good preachers. This is all that is necessary here, and I am certain that our numbers would soon increase."

At *Falkirk*, there have been for many years, a few friends to the principles of Unitarianism, who are zealous and willing to adopt any measures that may be proposed for the good of the general cause.

At *Kirkcaldy*, there are a few friends who regularly meet. Here it was that the Almighty was pleased to close the labours of the venerable Mr. Strephon, that indefatigable labourer in the Unitarian cause. One of the brethren from this place was prevented from attending the association, through ill health.

At *Dundee* the regular attendants are about sixty; and in consequence of the spirited and zealous exertions of some individuals in the society, whose names it might be proper to mention, only that they seek not honour from men, the cause of uncorrupted christianity will soon, we trust, make an extensive and conspicuous appearance.

At *Edinburgh*, the cause under the pastoral care of the Rev. T. S Smith, is making a grand and rapid progress. The number of regular attendants is nearly two hundred. In consequence of Mr. Smith having begun a course of evening lectures once a fortnight, on the doctrine of universal restoration, the chapel on these occasions is always filled. The entrance to the place, however, and the place itself where the society at present meets, is very uncomfortable. "Many instances of the injury which the want of a more respectable place, has been to the Society, have come to its knowledge. To procure a better is, at present, impossible, unless the friends to freedom of inquiry in religion, will contribute their aid. The members and avowed friends of the society are, at present, not very considerable in number, and their rank in life enables them to contribute but little. They have, however, exerted themselves to the utmost of their power; and when they consider how little is accomplished, and how much remains to be done, they are discouraged, indeed, but they do not despair; they look with hope to England; they appeal with confidence to the enlightened and respectable friends of rational religion there, and are satisfied that when their situation is distinctly laid before them, they will chearfully contribute their aid towards rendering Unitarianism as respectable in the metropolis of Scotland, as it is in that of England."

There are several other places in Scotland, where Unitarianism is secretly believed and openly avowed. But owing to the shortness of the notice for holding the Association, intelligence could not be procured in time, from any other places, but we hope, at the next anniversary, which will be held at *Glasgow*, sometime in the month of May or June, we shall be enabled to give particulars respecting the above and other places not at present taken notice of, still more satisfactory and encouraging.

We, however, congratulate all the friends to the cause of pure Christianity on this glorious meeting. It will tend to unite us all, and to promote brotherly love and union amongst each other. Alone we can do but little, and in a long time; united, we may accomplish much and in a short period.

After the business of the day, the friends dined together at Ferguson's Tavern, Mr. J. Morison, of Edinburgh, in the chair. Thirty-eight gentlemen sat down to dinner.

It would be gratifying to us to give some account of the speeches that were delivered, but it would swell this account to too great a length; suffice it to say, they were truly characteristic of the warmth and animation which the glorious doctrines of uncorrupted Christianity are calculated to inspire. The evening was passed in the greatest harmony, and the company broke up at an early hour, the old astonished to have beheld such a meeting in Scotland, and the young full of confident expectation that this was but the prelude to many others still more numerous, respectable and happy.

G. H.

Western Unitarian Society.

The Annual Meeting of this Society was held at the Baptist Meeting in Taunton, on Wednesday the 14th of July. The Rev. T. Howe delivered a discourse, (from John xvii. 20, 21,) which breathed the genuine spirit of Christian piety and liberality, and, while it obviated some of the scriptural objections against Unitarianism, exhibited the natural influence of that system on the happiness and moral worth of those who embrace it. The Rev. Edmund Butcher, the Rev. Henry Turner, of Bradford, in Yorkshire, and the Rev. George Kenrick, of Chesterfield, conducted the other parts of the service. The usual business of the Society was afterwards transacted in the meeting-house; and several new members were admitted. The thanks of the Society were unanimously voted to Wm. Smith, Esq. M. P. for his uniform and enlightened support of the cause of religious liberty, and particuarly for his exertions to obtain the repeal of the penal statutes against Anti-Trinitarians' publicly avowing and defending their principles: and the chairman (Richard Hall Clarke, Esq. of Bridwell House) was requested to communicate this resolution to him in behalf of the Meeting. The Rev. Dr. Toulmin gave great satisfaction to the Society by intimating his intention to prepare for the press a series of Family Prayers, corresponding to his excellent Prayers for the Closet. The thanks of the Society were given to Wm. Manningford, Esq. of Bristol, for his very able and active discharge of the office of Secretary, (which it was earnestly hoped he would long continue to undertake); and also to the Rev John Rowe, for his unremitted and important exertions for the welfare of the Society.

The business of the society being concluded. between forty and fifty gentlemen (principally members) dined together; when M. Blake, Esq. M. D. was called to the chair. The sentiments which were afterwards proposed, gave an opportunity to Messrs. Howe, Butcher and Rowe, Dr Toulmin and other gentlemen, to address the meeting on various subjects connected with the diffusion of religious knowledge in general, and of Unitarianism in particular. Mr. Rowe gave an account of the progress of the Society from its commencement, which presented great cause for thankfulness for the past and encouragement for the future. Indeed, whatever may be asserted by the adversaries of Unitarianism, there is no reasonable ground to doubt, that its grand principles (the proper Unity of God and the restriction of worship to the Father,) are rapidly gaining a firm and extensive footing among scripturalists of various denominations; and we indulge the hope that its delightful views of the character and dispensations of the God of love and mercy, and of the real nature and value of those glad tidings which our Saviour brought from his God and Father, and which he died to assure to us,—in connection with its strict and comprehensive principles of Christian duty, will, under the divine blessing, be abundantly efficacious in promoting holiness in heart and in life. When the health of the Rev. T Howe was drunk, with "thanks to him for his appropriate and excellent discourse," he was strongly urged to publish it, and respectfully solicited to give with it some account of the mental processes by which he had been led to embrace the doctrine of the proper or simple humanity of Jesus Christ, in connection with the essential principles of Unitarianism. Dr. Carpenter took occasion to call the attention of the meeting to the infant societies associating for Unitarian worship in Falmouth and Flushing. He represented them as affording a very important means of effectually distributing Unitarian tracts in Cornwall,* where, though Unitarianism is likely to meet with great opposition, several circumstances, (connected with the increasing spread of religious knowledge and the superior intellectual character of a large proportion of the Cornish people,) give great room to hope, that all opposition will be ineffectual, and that the seeds of scriptural truth will, in a few years, produce an abundant harvest.† He also gave some account of the Rev. Mr. Treleaven, who has lately left the Wesleyan Methodists at Falmouth, (being led to a close examination of the New Testament by their persecution of Mr. Philp and his friends,) and is now gone to preach at Dorchester, where we hope the divine blessing will accompany his labours in the great cause of Christian truth and duty.—Towards the close of the proceedings, before the evening service, an affecting mark of esteem and respect was shewn to one who is eminently deserving of them. Adverting to the tribute of respect which had just been paid to the memory of Dr. Priestley, Mr. Lindsey, and Mr. Kenrick, Mr. Rowe expressed his desire not to be unmindful of the living, and at the close of a brief address, which will be long remembered for its eloquence and pathos, he said, "If there be one present, who, in periods of difficulty and trial, as well as in the hour of prosperity, has manifested the influence of Christian principle,—if there be one present whose *hoary head is a crown of glory*,—I am persuaded that you will feel great satisfaction in joining in a testimony of affectionate respect to him: I therefore propose the health of the Rev. Dr. Toulmin." The minds of all present must have been benefited by the honour thus paid to Christian worth. The appeal was received with the liveliest sympathy: every one rose up; and the hearts of all were affected. Only one could have a single *painful* emotion at that time: and when *he* rose to express his thanks, it was obvious that the feelings of the moment were not unmixed. His words were few, and those but partially heard; but the picture of the aged Christian must be indelibly impressed upon the memory of every one then present. It was indeed a most interesting scene; and we hope for his forgiveness in endeavouring to convey some faint idea of it to absent friends.

---

* At the suggestion of the worthy Secretary of the London Unitarian Society, the Committee of that Society some time ago sent books to the Flushing Unitarians to the amount of five or six Guineas.

† We may suggest to our readers that any Unitarian Tracts they can spare may be sent to Mr. Philp at Falmouth, (who regularly officiates at the two places,) or to Mr. Prout at Flushing: or if they are sent to the Rev. I. Worsley of Plymouth, or to Dr. Carpenter, Exeter, they will be forwarded.

In the evening, Dr. Toulmin conducted the devotional service, and Dr. Carpenter delivered a discourse from 1 Pet. i. 8. " Whom not having seen, ye love;" the object of which was to prove, that the love of Christ is a natural and reasonable affection.

" Thus the whole of the day," to adopt the close of another account, " was spent in cheerfulness and harmony,—in the indulgence of the feelings of zeal and charity; and, it is humbly trusted, in sincere devotion and mutual edification in Christian truth and virtue." —(*Taunton Courier.*)

Aug. 21, 1813. Y.

First Annual Meeting of the Eastern Unitarian Book Society.

The formation of a Book Society in the Eastern district of the kingdom has been long wanted, and by the friends of religious truth long desired. Recent circumstances have rendered it more than ever desirable, since, in addition to the congregation at Norwich, assembling at the Octagon, two other societies (the one under the ministry of the Rev. Is. Perry, and the General Baptist church under the Rev. H. Winder) now meet for the worship of the ONE GOD. In the month of March last the Society was formed, and on the 21st and 22d of July the first annual meeting was held at Norwich. The first service was on Wednesday evening, at the Octagon. Mr. Toms, of Framlingham, delivered the introductory prayer and read the scriptures, after which Mr. Gilchrist of London prayed. Mr. Aspland preached from 2 Cor. x. 7. " If any man trust in himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that, as he is Christ's, even so are we also Christ's." On Thursday morning service was performed at Mr. Perry's meeting. Mr. Scargill, of Bury St. Edmunds, delivered the introductory prayer and read the scriptures, after which Mr. Toms prayed, and Mr. Aspland preached from 1 Tim. ii. 5. " For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." After service the business of the society was transacted, Mr. Toms in the chair. I. L. Marsh, Esq. was chosen Treasurer, and the Rev. I. Perry and Mr. Edw. Taylor, Secretaries. The committee for the ensuing year was appointed and the following among other resolutions were passed.

" That the cordial thanks of this Society be given to the Rev. Robert Aspland for his ready compliance with its wishes, and for the excellent sermons which he has preached: and that he be requested to print them at the charge of the Society.

" That the thanks of this Society be given to the several other ministers who are not members of it for their attendance and assistance.

" That the next annual Meeting be held at Yarmouth, and that the Rev. T. Madge be invited to preach."

The above request Mr. Aspland has complied with, and the sermons will shortly appear in print.

The friends of the Society afterwards dined together at the Swan, to the number of sixty-two, Mr. John Taylor in the chair. The ministers present were Messrs. Aspland and Gilchrist, Wright of Wisbeach, Philpot of Saffron Walden, Perry, Madge and Winder of Norwich, Toms of Framlingham, Tremlett of Hapton and Scargill of Bury. The following toasts were given. —The King.—Civil and Religious Liberty all the world over.—The Eastern Unitarian Society.—The Rev. Robert Aspland.—Mr. W. Smith.—The Lord Bishop of the Diocese.—Mr. Wright and the Unitarian Fund.—Mr. Gilchrist and the Unitarians of Scotland. —Catholic Emancipation.—Prosperity to the York Academy.—Our Christian Brethren the General Baptists.

Many highly interesting speeches were made by different gentlemen present, and the day past in Christian fellowship and social harmony.

On the following Sunday Mr. Aspland and Mr. Gilchrist preached at the three Unitarian chapels in Norwich. The services were all well attended, and the number of hearers increased regularly. On the Sunday evening nearly 1000 persons were present at the Octagon.

Such was the first general meeting of the Eastern Unitarian Society, and the warm interest which it excited encourages the most pleasing expectations as to its eventual success. The plans of the Society, as they are more generally known, will be better understood and their utility more widely felt. Aside from the general feeling which such a meeting must necessarily excite, the public services on this occasion derived some degree of interest from circumstances of a local nature. From the pulpit at the Octagon the doctrine of the Divine Unity was first preached by Dr. John Taylor, and the design and object of the present Society warmly recommended by his successor, Dr. Enfield. (See his Sermon on the Progress of Religious Knowledge.) The chapel in which Mr. Perry preaches was till lately occupied by the Wesleyan Methodists: and that of the General Baptists, formerly part of a monastery of the White Friars, was endowed by the celebrated Thomas Grantham. It was highly gratifying to see the ministers of these different congregations uniting with sincere cordiality and zeal in the promotion of the same great cause.

The words of Dr. Enfield, in the sermon above referred to, have so direct a reference to the views and intentions of the present Society that they may be properly used to close the account of its proceedings. "Let both ministers and people heartily unite their endeavours to restore the original purity and simplicity of the Christian doctrine, and to rescue Christian worship from every disgrace or incumbrance, which priestcraft or fanaticism has brought upon it: always remembering that it is more consistent with the true spirit of Christianity, *the great author of which was*, in the most respectable sense of the word, a REFORMER, to be ever ready to encourage and promote improvements in religious opinions and practices, than to be rigidly tenacious of ancient tenets and forms, merely because they are such: and that it is an honest, impartial, and unprejudiced freedom of thinking and discoursing upon all subjects whatever, conducted with humility, decency and information, which ought to distinguish the religion of a Christian from that of all the world besides. In this manner it is to be hoped that the friends of truth, virtue, and religion will unite to carry forwards the good work of reformation. Nor shall it be doubted, that their united efforts will produce the most glorious and happy effects. Yes, I will foretell, (and may it please the great Lord of Nature to fulfil the prediction) that the cloud which was once 'no bigger than a man's hand,' shall at length spread over the whole heavens, and water every region of the earth with the dews of heavenly wisdom; that truth shall at last triumph over error, charity over persecution, and religion and virtue over profaneness and immorality; that all the nations of the world, subjected to the laws of truth and righteousness, shall become the spiritual kingdom of God; and that the whole earth shall be one holy temple consecrated unto the Lord."

E. T.

Lincolnshire and Cambridgeshire Unitarian Association.

Boston, August 9*th*, 1813.

On Thursday, July 29th, the Association of Unitarian Ministers and Friends of the Counties of Lincoln and Cambridge was held at Boston. The Unitarian meeting-house being too small for the number of persons assembled, the Rev. W. Taylor, and the General Baptist congregation, permitted their chapel to be used for the occasion. Divine service commenced at eleven o'clock in the morning, with reading the scriptures, and with prayer, by the Rev. Mr. Hawkes of Lincoln, after which a sermon was preached by the Rev. R. Aspland of Hackney, from 2 Cor. x. 7. in which he set forth the principles of Unitarianism, and exhorted his hearers not only to pursue a spirit of free inquiry, but also of liberality. The preacher prefaced his discourse with a testimonial of gratitude towards the minister and congregation who had so willingly lent their chapel on this occasion; and observed that were such instances of liberality more frequent, it would tend to wear down the rough edges of the differences between Christians, and lead them to think of each other with mutual forbearance and good will. After service the friends of Unitarianism, of both sexes, to the number of one hundred and ten, dined together at the White Hart Inn; Mr. Aspland in the Chair. After dinner, it was agreed to engraft upon the association a Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge and the Practice of Virtue by the Distribution of Books: to be denominated the NORTH EASTERN UNITARIAN BOOK SOCIETY: several animated addresses were delivered by the chairman, Rev. Mr. Gilchrist, of London, Rev. Thos. Madge, of Norwich, Rev. R. Wright, Rev. Mr. Hawkes, &c. &c. In the evening there was divine service again at the General Baptist chapel, when an excellent sermon was preached by the Rev. Thos. Madge from 1 Cor. i. 5, latter part, on the peculiar advantages and consolations of the Unitarian view of Christianity. The Rev. R. Wright continued at Boston, and preached at the Unitarian chapel on the Sunday following, and the Rev. R. Aspland returned, and preached a discourse on Christian zeal, from Rom. x. 2. on Tuesday evening, August 3rd, to a crowded congregation. In the intervals large parties assembled together, for conversation, inquiry and improvement. On the whole, it was the most interesting and satisfactory meeting of the kind ever held in these parts, and it is to be hoped that it will make a lasting impression on the minds of all who attended, and be a means of promoting the great cause of truth, righteousness, and charity. The minister of the place endeavoured to improve the whole for the benefit of his congregation in a sermon on Sunday, August 8th, from 1 John i. 7. "We have fellowship one with another."

J. P.

Act of Parliament for the Relief of Unitarians.

The Trinity Bill, as must be well known to our readers, has at length passed into a law. This important Act received the Royal Assent, on Wednesday, July 21, on which day Unitarians became for the first time freemen in their native land.

We here give this Act; and below we shall insert also the Bill that passed the House of Commons, but was thrown out on the ground of informality, in the House of Lords, and likewise a brief account of the speeches of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Chester on the Third Reading of the second and successful Bill, in the House of Lords. The Book Society and the Unitarian Fund have held general meetings, and published Resolutions on the occasion. (See the Cover of the present No.) These, with other public documents, relating to this happy affair, we shall hereafter bring into the body of our work. The event gave rise to Thanksgiving Sermons at Essex Street, the New Gravel Pit, Hackney, and other places; Mr. Belsham's Sermon is already before the public.

An Act to relieve Persons who impugn the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity from certain Penalties.

Whereas, in the nineteenth year of his present Majesty an Act was passed, intituled *An Act for the further Relief of Protestant Dissenting Ministers and Schoolmasters;* and it is expedient to enact as herein after provided: be it therefore enacted by the King's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that so much of an Act passed in the first year of the reign of King William and Queen Mary, intituled *An Act for exempting his Ma-*

jesty's Protestant Subjects dissenting from the Church of England, from the Penalties of certain Laws, as provides that that Act or any thing therein contained should not extend, or be construed to extend to give any ease, benefit or advantage to persons denying the *Trinity* as therein mentioned, be and the same is hereby repealed.

And be it further enacted, that the provisions of anotner Act passed in the ninth and tenth years of the reign of King William, intituled *An Act for the more effectual suppressing Blasphemy and Profaneness*, so far as the same relate to persons denying as therein mentioned, respecting the *Holy Trinity* be, and the same are hereby repealed.

And whereas it is expedient to repeal an Act, passed in the Parliament of Scotland in the first Parliament of King Charles the Second, intituled *An Act against the Crime of Blasphemy;* and another Act, passed in the Parliament of Scotland in the first Parliament of King William, intituled *An Act against Blasphemy;* which Acts respectively ordain the Punishment of death; be it therefore enacted, that the said Acts and each of them shall be, and the same are and is hereby repealed.

And be it further enacted, that this Act shall be deemed and taken to be a public Act, and shall be judicially taken notice of as such by all judges, justices and others, without being specially pleaded.

A Bill [as amended by the Committee] *to grant further Relief to Persons differing in Opinion from the Church of England, with respect to certain Penal ties imposed by law on those who impugn the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.*

Whereas, by an Act of the first year of King William and Queen Mary, intituled, "An Act for exempting their Majesties Protestant Subjects dissenting from the Church of England from the Penalties of certain Laws," Persons denying in their preaching or writing the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, are excluded from the benefit of the said Act; and by an Act of the ninth and tenth of King William, further Penalties, therein specified, are enacted against all Persons having been educated in or having made profession of the Christian religion, who by writing, printing, teaching or advised speaking, shall deny any one of the Persons of the Holy Trinity to be God:

And whereas in the nineteenth year of his present Majesty, an Act was passed, intituled "An Act for the further Relief of Protestant Dissenting Ministers and Schoolmasters:" whereby they are exempted from the necessity of subscribing or declaring their approbation of the Articles of the Church of England, not excepting those which relate to the Holy Trinity; and a declaration of their belief in the Holy Scriptures, as their rule of faith and practice, is substituted in lieu thereof.

And whereas, notwithstanding the said Act for their relief from the said subscription, such persons are still liable to the grievous penalties of the ninth and tenth of King William, if in their writing, printing, teaching or advised speaking, they interpret the Holy Scriptures inconsistently with the said doctrines of the Holy Trinity, as laid down in the said Articles; whereby the benefit of toleration is taken from the said persons, and the "further relief" granted to them by the Act of the nineteenth of his present Majesty, is destroyed and made of no eeffct:

Be it therefore enacted, by the King's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that from and after the passing of this Act, so much of the said Act of the first year of King William and Queen Mary, as excludes from the ease, benefit and advantage granted thereby, and so much of the said Act of the ninth and tenth of King William, and of all or any other Act or Acts of the English, Scotch, British, Irish, or united Parliaments, as imposes penalties on those who interpret the Holy Scriptures inconsistently with the doctrines of the Holy Trinity as laid down in the thirty nine articles of the United Church of England and Ireland, be and the same are hereby repealed; except so far as may relate to ministers of the said United Church.

And be it further enacted that this Act shall be deemed and taken to be a public Act, and shall be judicially taken notice of as such by all Judges, Justices and others, without being specially pleaded.

House of Peers, Tuesday July 20.

On the question for the Third Reading of the TRINITY DOCTRINE BILL,

The Archbishop of Canterbury made a few remarks upon the well-merited character of the Established Church of England for its due attention to the principles of genuine toleration. In this view the Church and State were to a certain extent reciprocal, each taking its hue from the character and conduct of the other. Their authorities were however in some respects confounded. The Church, as a Church, had no authority to inflict punishments upon those not within its pale. The principle of toleration to which the Bill referred, appertained rather to the State than to the Church; and the latter was always remarkable for its tender regard with respect to the religious scruples of individuals; and on these principles he had no objection to the passing of the Bill.

The Bishop of Chester agreed in principle with the most Reverend Prelate; but observed, he thought the Bill was not called for in consequence of any penalties imposed upon those whom it professed to releive. The most perfect toleration was already extended to the professors of Unitarianism. At the same time, he was pleased such a Bill was brought forward, as affording an additional proof that intolerance was no part of the character of the Church of England.

The Bill was then read a third time and passed.—*Sun, July* 21.

OBITUARY.

Rev. Hugh Worthington.

July 26, 1813, Died at Worthing, in Sussex, in the 61st year of his age, the Rev. HUGH WORTHINGTON, for forty years pastor of the large and respectable Society of *Presbyterian* dissenters assembling for public worship at SALTERS' HALL in this city. For the last two or three years, this distinguished and useful minister had been visibly on the decline; his visit to Worthing was for the express purpose of recruiting, by a suspension of his public labours, and the restorative quiet of a sea-side residence, his failing strength. By multitudes it was earnestly hoped that these means might have proved efficacious, and that a life so dear to the cause of "practical piety," and impressive scriptural preaching, might have been further prolonged. This, however, did not seem right to HIM who orders all things in the wisest and best manner. A severe cough had long been one of his complaints, and the bursting of a blood vessel in one of the paroxysms of it was the immediate cause of his death. It was well remarked in one of the public papers, which announced the event, that he was "a man whose value it was as difficult to appreciate, as it would be to supply his loss."

Mr. Worthington was almost a singular instance of great popularity in a London pulpit for the long space of forty years. There are so many competitors for this sort of fame in the metropolis, the love of novelty and the fastidiousness of caprice in hearers is so pampered, that it rarely happens that any preacher, however excellent, can, for many years secure the attendance of a numerous auditory. Those who knew Mr. Worthington, however, and were acquainted with the peculiar vivacity and impressiveness of his *manner*, as well as the excellence of his matter, will, in a great measure cease to wonder at the effects which it produced, and the steady attachment to his ministry which it secured. His pulpit talents were of a very high order: he was no copyist; his manner was truly original, and it was all his own. There were great peculiarities, but there was no affectation about him. His devotional services were various, pathetic, and, often, unusually appropriate, and yet it was not always the best style of prayer which he adopted. He was greatly under the influence of his feelings, and in the pulpit he frequently felt with uncommon force; hence, many of those short extemporaneous effusions in which, upon the spur of the occasion, he poured forth the fulness of his spirit, and said things which seized with irresistible force on the memory, and penetrated the very hearts of his hearers. He did not stand like a statue in the pulpit; his action, especially in the earlier part of his life, was sometimes exuberant, and never particularly graceful, but it was natural to him; it was the unstudied action of a man in earnest, and, therefore, except to some very fastidious observers, never gave offence. His eye was peculiarly bright and searching, and, even in the latter part of his life, when he took off his spectacles, its penetrating glance helped, in no small degree to rivet the attention to what he was saying. His discourses were certainly, not models of correct composition, but there was an *unction* and ardor about them which mere correctness could never hope to reach; and, in almost *all cases*, had the *outline* been filled up as well as it was *defined*, they would, even as compositions, have been entitled to solid praise. He was, generally, very happy in seizing upon the peculiar feature of his text, and his manner of dividing a subject was simple and perspicuous. He was a better *textual* than *topical* preacher. A praise, however, greatly higher than all this is his due. His main object was the best interests of his hearers, and his discourses were calculated to mend the heart and regulate the affections. The morality of the gospel, in all its ramifications, was the theme on which he delighted to dwell, and the considerations by which he pressed its practice were truly evangelical. His intercourse with mankind was considerable, and he availed himself of the knowledge of human nature, and of real life with which it furnished him, to come at the consciences of his auditors. When he attacked vice he was no flatterer. He did not prophecy "smooth things" to the vicious or the impenitent. He was no *vulgar* preacher of damnation, he had too much sense, and too much piety for that; but, when his subject called for them, he did not keep out of sight "the terrors of the Lord." He loved, however, rather to allure than to threaten, and thought it far more consistent with the "spirit of Jesus" to draw men to goodness with the cords of love, than to drive them from vice with the rod of terror. He was very attentive to "existing circumstances" both public and private, and extremely happy in his endeavours to improve them by religious counsels and considerations. He had a natural eloquence which shone with peculiar lustre when he was called forth upon public occasions, and even when he had no time for previous preparation; in such cases his language was generally strikingly appropriate. As a companion and friend, his loss will be severely felt by numbers; he was no enemy to innocent cheerfulness, and his memory was well stored with both useful and entertaining anecdotes. His company and his preaching were very acceptable to young people: it has often been remarked of him that he preached to the young, and it is not easy to pay a higher compliment than this, either to the heart or the head of a minister. If he can gain the attention and love of the young, he may hope to do some comparatively lasting good, and may console himself under the indifference of middle-life, and the frequent apathy of old age.

Mr. Worthington's reputation as a preacher standing so high, it is no wonder that he was often called upon to advocate the cause of distress, and to plead for the support of those various charitable institutions to which the London dissenters so liberally contribute—it is scarcely necessary to add, that in all such cases, he was a *willing* and a *successful* pleader. He was fully sensible of the value of co-operation in the pursuit of any object, and, upon this principle, he was a great friend to "meetings of ministers," and occasional, and stated Lectures. For many years he was an active member of what was termed the "Buckinghamshire Association," which was holden twice a year in different parts of that county. He took his turn in what was termed the "Merchants' Lecture," on a Tuesday, at Salter's Hall: and when that was dropped, in conjunction with some other ministers, he engaged, for some years, in a Lecture on the Wednesday evening, at the same place; this was confined to the winter season, and to once a fortnight. He was no friend to Lectures on the Lord's Day evening, but as he thought them admissible in *large* towns, if any where, and as his own services were always acceptable, he was, for many years, one of the preachers of the long established Sunday evening lecture at Salters' Hall.

One part of Mr. W's conduct ought by no means to pass unnoticed. He was always ready to promote the wishes of serious and well disposed young men who were desirous of becoming ministers of the gospel. He gave them the best advice, procured them pecuniary assistance, and, in some instances, personally aided their preparatory studies. Several ministers who are now, and have been long, usefully employed in their Master's work, would, perhaps, never have entered upon it had it not been for the early encouragement, and the subsequent aid of the pastor of Salters'

Hall. It is but justice to add that nothing but unworthy conduct ever induced him to withdraw the friendship he had once given. The distresses, on account of the smallness of their stipends, to which many of his brethren, in the Christian ministry, are exposed, lay near his heart; he was often a successful advocate with persons of affluence, for their relief, and, to some of them, he was himself uniformly kind and beneficent.

It has already been remarked that his preaching was eminently practical. He very seldom brought controversy into the pulpit, or delivered what might properly be denominated *doctrinal* sermons. He made no secret, however, of his religious sentiments: they were those usually styled *Arian*, but he had too much knowledge of the real difficulties of theology, and too much Christian candour, to condemn with asperity the *creeds* of any of his brethren. Those views of Christianity to which he adhered through life, it appears he embraced very early, at least he was thus congratulated upon his *steadiness* by a friend and fellow student in the month of August 1806, in the dedication of a volume of lectures to him. "Of the same standing in life, educated at the same Academy, and class-fellows for five years, we embraced the same system of religious opinions, which further examination has not induced us to relinquish. Your active mind and popular talents pointed out, as your proper sphere, the metropolis, and that respectable Society, which invited you to become their minister. There, walking in the steps of your venerable and excellent father, you have maintained the cause of rational piety, and laboured with undiminished acceptance and usefulness."

He was the eldest son of the venerable Hugh Worthington, A. M. who was, for above forty years, minister to a numerous and respectable society of dissenters at Leicester. He received his academical education at *Daventry*, under the tuition of the Rev. Caleb Ashworth, D.D. Immediately upon leaving the academy, Mr. Worthington was invited to Salters' Hall, as assistant to the Rev. Francis Spilsbury, whose funeral sermon he preached March 17, 1782. It is a little remarkable that he also had filled that pulpit for forty years. What a large portion of a century do these two periods make, and in that space, or rather in seventy-two years, as Mr. Worthington was eight years assistant preacher, Salters' Hall has had only *two* pastors! Mr. Worthington's last sermon was delivered July 11th, 1813.

After this he left the metropolis for Worthing, which for many years had been his favourite resort. He had frequently found relief from sea-air, and was willing to make the experiment again. Here he passed a fortnight without any material change, but with occasional alterations for the better. On Sunday, the 25th, he attended public worship, expressed himself pleased with the performance of the services, although those services were conducted on the principles of Calvinism, from which he was ever averse. He spent the evening with his usual cheerfulness, and retired at his accustomed hour.

About five o'clock on the following morning, owing probably to a fit of coughing, he burst a blood-vessel. Assistance was soon obtained, and his anxious friends, who had accompanied him to the sea-side, administered to him whatever might tend to alleviate the complaint. For a short time, it was thought the danger was subsiding, and one of them expressed a hope that he would soon be better, to which he replied with his usual emphasis, *No never; I feel now as I never felt before:* he was, however, perfectly calm and collected, and having uttered a short but fervent prayer, quite in his usual manner, *Gracious Father, forgive thy servant, and receive him to thyself,* he breathed his last without a groan or a struggle.

His body was removed from Worthing to his house in Northampton Square, London, and on the evening of the fifth of August it was conveyed to Salters' Hall meeting-house, from whence it was carried to Bunhill Fields on the next day, attended by a number of ministers, chiefly of the Calvinistical persuasion, who had been invited to attend the remains of their friend to his last home. A considerable number of the congregation attended, in eighteen mourning coaches, and some other carriages followed in the rear. The funeral service was performed by the Rev. Thomas Tayler, formerly, and very many years, the respectable pastor of the congregation at Carter Lane, near St. Paul's. On Sunday, the 8th, the Rev. Dr. Lindsay delivered an eloquent and pathetic discourse to the afternoon congregation at Salters' Hall, which we had hoped to have seen from the press before this, and from which, in a following number of the Repository, we shall, if the opportunity be allowed us, be glad to present our readers with an extract or two.

Mr. Worthington, as an author, did not leave many works behind him. His celebrity rests almost entirely upon his merits as an impressive and interesting preacher. He published in 1775, a Sermon, entitled "A good Character is better than a great Fortune;" in 1778, a Discourse preached for the benefit of the charity-school in Gravel-lane, on "The Progress of Moral Corruption;" and another preached on the 5th of November in the same year, before the Supporters of the Lecture at Salters' Hall, entitled, "Christianity an easy and liberal system; that of Popery absurd and burdensome." In 1780 he published "An Essay on the Resolution of Plane Triangles by Common Arithmetic:" in 1782 he published a Sermon and Oration; the one preached at Salters' Hall, and the other delivered in Bunhill Fields, occasioned by the death of Mr. Spilsbury.

In 1789 he delivered a sermon to the supporters of the New College, Hackney, which was printed. He printed two or three other sermons which had been preached in behalf of useful and excellent charities. It is said his friends have an intention of reprinting all his works in a small volume. Mr. Worthington was the editor of a volume of his father's Sermons, and on the death of that venerable man he printed in the Protestant

Dissenters' Magazine, and in the Monthly Magazine, a memoir of him: to a volume of Sermons of the late Mr. Crabb, of which Mr. W. was the editor, he likewise prefixed a memoir.

For some years before his death, he promised his friends a volume of sermons, and a part of it, it is believed was some years ago actually in the press. Whether any materials are left for the completion of such a volume, is not perhaps at present ascertained; should it be practicable, there can be no doubt of its being a very acceptable present to the numerous friends who honour his memory, and lament his loss.

E. B.

Rev. W. Severn.

The Rev. Wm. Severn, whose sudden death we announced in our last, (Wrapper, p. 2.) was born at Nottingham. His father was a respectable wine merchant in that place, and had two other sons. William, the subject of this memoir, from his earliest years manifested a strong propensity to the ministry, and at the age of sixteen became a convert to the doctrines and discipline of Methodism; a circumstance, which, since he arrived at years of maturity, he never ceased to deplore. On the declaration of his determination to follow Mr. Wesley, he was expelled from his father's house, and obliged to take refuge with Mr. Warwick, father of the present Dr. Warwick, of Rotherham, and, under his protection, became, not only one of the most popular preachers, but a friend and confidential companion of Mr. Wesley himself. For two years, he was the travelling associate of that extraordinary person, who appears, from letters to Mr. Severn, to have greatly admired his talents, zeal and intrepidity. Of the period when Mr. Severn began to waver in his attachment to his profession as a teacher of the doctrines of Methodism, no satisfactory information can be obtained; but, from a short journal now in existence of his daily labors, during part of his twentieth year, it is manifest, in every fresh memorandum, that his mind was then very little at ease, and that there was a something in his situation which rendered it very irksome. His daily prayer was for more faith, for a firmer conviction, and for greater assistance from God in the duties that lay before him. This journal is continued only for a few months, but it is ascertained, that soon after that period, he went to Edinburgh to study divinity. From this seminary he returned, in course, and was settled as preacher, with a small congregation of, as the phrase is, moderately *orthodox* dissenters at Weedon-beck in Northamptonshire. From Weedon he was called to Welford in the same county, and afterwards removed to Hinckley in Leicestershire, in all which situations his services and character were greatly admired and approved. It must have been during his residence at Hinckley that his Unitarian propensities took a decided tone; for, from thence he was invited to a congregation at Norwich under that denomination. Kidderminster had the benefit of his ministerial services some years before his translation to Hull, where he lived between five and six years. Where-ever he resided, his character, for the practice of every virtue, that can adorn a man and a Christian minister, stood deservedly high, but it has not come to the knowledge of the writer of this, that his course was distinguished by any very striking occurrence. During the whole of his residence at Hull, so correct was every part of his conduct, that the breath of calumnious bigotry has not even attempted to soil his well-earned title to the good opinion of all with whom he was connected. Mr. Severn's favourite study was sacred writ, and it may be safely said, that in scriptural knowledge he had very few equals. He used to lament his own deficiency, and, looking back to the part he acted in his youth, to wish that the time he then spent in teaching what he had not studied and did not understand, had been spent at college. But his modesty was equal to his acquirements. He was a decided Unitarian; on some of the minor topics in the Unitarian creed, however, retaining the opinions of his early days. As an advocate for inquiry his zeal was unbounded: he loved a free-thinker in his heart, of whatever sentiments, provided he was an honest man. Not more zealous in searching for truth, than in its propagation, he never shunned, on proper occasions, the assertion of it. A bigot was the object of his peculiar detestation, and if he met with an Unitarian bigot, as he sometimes did, never failed to urge upon his understanding the inconsistency betwixt his principles and his practice. Mr. Severn was a truly good man, and a faithful follower of Jesus Christ—of course, his death, awful to all around him, was not unprepared for, as far as respected his future prospects, for he had always lived as one who must give an account; and as to his friends, neither presumptuous in allotting to him his station in the future world, nor doubtful concerning it, they have the comfort to reflect, that the remembrance of him will always be sweet, and that his name is never mentioned but to receive a willing tribute of respect and esteem. He was in his 59th year, when Providence thought fit to call him away. To the hour of his death no part of his vigor and vivacity had failed him, though sometimes, during the last two years, symptoms had appeared of the disorder which carried him off. On the very evening of his dissolution, half an hour before he became lifeless clay, he was in cheerful conversation with a friend, as full of anecdote as at any former period of his life.

G. L.

Rev. J. Jones.

Died at Clifton, near Bristol, on Thursday, May 27th, 1813, in the 33d year of his age, the REV. JOHN JONES, late pastor of the congregation of Unitarian dissenters in Plymouth.—This truly amiable young man, was born at Cwmbryn, near Gellionnen, in the parish of Langyvelach, in the county of Glamorgan, Wales; of which place his father was a respectable farmer. His mother was sister to the late Rev. Roger Howell, of Beckington. He received his grammatical education under the Rev. William Howell, of Swansea. When very young, he was admitted a student into the academy at Carmarthen, conducted by the Rev. Mr. Peter and the Rev. Mr. Davies; where he continued three years; and thence removed to York, under the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, for one year. During his academical course, Mr. Jones applied with great assiduity to his various studies; and made considerable proficiency, particularly in the Classics and Mathematics.—On leaving York, he went to Bridgewater, in Somersetshire, and for a few months officiated there to a society of Unitarian dissenters. He then engaged himself as a private tutor, in the family of Mrs. Morgan, relict of the late Rev. George Morgan; in which situation he remained about two years. Having then received an invitation to become pastor of a church at Belper, in Derbyshire, he accepted it; and after residing there about a year, he finally settled in Plymouth; where he continued till within eight months of his decease.

On the 10th of April, 1807, Mr.

Jones accepted the office of minister of Plymouth Chapel. At this time it was but thinly attended; his excellent sermons, however, soon attracted notice, and a respectable congregation was in a short time formed, with a successive increase.—His mind was not only richly stored with theological knowledge, but he possessed a happy facility of conveying his ideas, on all subjects, though not ostentatiously, in language perspicuous and elegant; and his reasoning was always nervous and cogent. His pulpit compositions were neatly polished, and the matter judiciously arranged and condensed. They were not interlarded with puerile flights of fancy, to court the glare and encomiums of a giddy multitude, but were pregnant with lore of the highest celestial importance. He was an ardent admirer of Mr. Cappe's excellent sermons, and often used them as models for his own. His subjects, in general, were of a moral and practical kind. This, however, was not strictly in unison with his own opinion of the nature of sermons for the benefit of a mixed audience; but it was adopted by him, in consequence of the different taste of some of the leading characters in his church. He himself saw the propriety, and indeed the absolute necessity of *frequently* bringing under review the *doctrines* of the gospel, as well as enforcing its moral precepts: and to the neglect of this practice among Unitarians, he ascribed the comparatively little success of their cause. The writer of this article laments that his deceased friend should have been in the least shackled, in this particular; as those discourses on *doctrinal* topics which he incidentally delivered, possessed considerable merit: and these, with several others, are highly deserving of publication. Had it been the will of Divine Providence to spare his life and health a few years longer, the press would have borne witness to his talents, in this, and perhaps, in many other respects.

In consequence of the solicitations of a few friends, Mr. Jones was induced to open in Plymouth, a Seminary, for teaching the Classics, Mathematics, &c. Among his loose memorandums, I find the event thus noticed by him: "On March 26, 1810, I opened my school, with two pupils. No very auspicious beginning: but I must not despair of farther encouragement, when the intelligence of my undertaking is more generally extended. But whatever may be the patronage I obtain, let me exert all diligence, prudence, and every other available method, to satisfy the expectations of those who entrust their children to my care; and to assist them as far as my powers will admit, in the acquisition of useful knowledge. Now that I have commenced the arduous undertaking, may God enable me to persevere in it, as far as it is consistent with his will, and is conducive to my benefit."—His pupils soon increased; and latterly he had under his tuition near forty. His conduct as a teacher of youth gave general satisfaction. He finally relinquished his school September 10, 1812; on which he thus observed—"A day rendered memorable to me by my being compelled, through the increase of indisposition, to give up my school. It is now too late to repent that I had not taken the resolution much earlier; before I had exhausted nature, and rendered my recovery more difficult, if not impracticable."—Though his highly cultivated mind was admirably adapted for this employment, his body was of too delicate a texture to endure the fatigues of a day-school, without an assistant; and his exertions in this line, no doubt, augmented the fatal disease which terminated his earthly career.—For the last two years of his life, he lingered under great debility of body, accompanied with a troublesome cough and frequent spitting of blood. And, to increase his heavy afflictions, while in this languid state, attempts, founded wholly on baseless reports, were made to sully his spotless character. But, notwithstanding the melancholy effects that emanated from this affair, (over which, I wish to draw an impervious veil) Mr. Jones bore all his sufferings with true Christian acquiescence; being firmly persuaded that every dispensation of heaven is wisely ordered for the best; and that what we usually consider misfortunes in this life, are only part of a fatherly course of discipline, designed to prepare us for higher degrees of felicity in that state into which the faithful shall enter on the morning of the resurrection. His views of the paternal and unbounded goodness of the one God and Father of all, entirely precluded gloomy and superstitious fears; and the promises of the gospel, were to him a never-failing source of sweet consolation. His belief of the truth of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, rested not on the opinion of his forefathers and early instructors, which is too commonly the case; but, on a careful examination and accurate balance of evidence, he was satisfactorily convinced of their divine original.

To give a correct view of the state of his mind a little while prior to his dissolution, I shall extract this following reflections, found among his papers, and dated Dec. 6, 1812. "I am very apprehensive that the malady will soon terminate my connections with this scene. It sometimes excites very serious thoughts in my mind. But it is injurious to my complaint to indulge querulous or despondent feelings; and inconsistent with the profession I have adopted (however unworthily maintained or imperfectly preserved) to express painful apprehensions: for a Christian should evidence his faith and hope, not in the sunshine of prosperity, or whilst health and vigour glow in his veins only, but in those very circumstances which are most fitly adapted, to try the validity of principles and sincerity of professions. In my situation, resignation enjoys an opportunity to signalize her peaceful and mild triumphs. If in sickness, laid on the bed of debility, a man, not only refrains from outward expression of querulous dissatisfaction, but from even feeling any discontent with the dispensations of heaven, and submits to the severe trial, not with the growl of impatience, or the efforts of repugnance, but with a well-grounded persuasion, that, under the Divine administration,—the evils, the abstinences, the privations which he now suffers, will be conducive to his future good, either in the correction of evil habits, in rectifying the errors of too great reliance upon the world, and in directing his view and elevating his hopes to those extatic scenes, into which none of the inhabitants with a heart of sorrow, is compelled to sigh, 'I am sick'—'*where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest.*'"

Mr. Jones was the warm friend of civil and religious liberty, in its fullest extent. He possessed an honest affectionate heart, and a mind truly independent, which soared above every species of artifice and disingenuous serviiity; and, except when roused by the pestiferous breath of "back-wounding calumny," was always mild and affable in his demeanour. As a companion and friend, he was intelligent, sincere, disinterested; and frequently indulged an innocent playfulness of temper. He was not fond, particularly in his latter years, of a promiscuous intercourse with the world, his habits and disposition being quite domestic, and, therefore, was not very extensively known. But his memory will long live in the bosom of a small circle of affectionate friends; and they who knew him best, will revere him most.—Farewell, dear departed guide and counsellor! Though thou art separated from us for a season, yet, ere long, will our intercourse be renewed, not in a world of envy and misrepresentation, but in the "Sweet fields beyond the swelling flood," where all is harmony and peace; and where, through eternal ages, we shall unite to sing the triumphs of redeeming love!

"Our hopes, still fix on joys to come,
  Those blissful scenes on high
Shall flourish in immortal bloom,
  When time and nature die."

Mr. Jones was interred May 30th, in the burial ground belonging to the Unitarian Chapel in Bristol; and his funeral was attended by his kind relation Mr. Perks, with a few other friends, among whom were the Rev. Dr. Estlin and the Rev. Mr. Maurice.—The writer conceives it would be indecorous to conclude this account of his friend, without publicly acknowledging the obligations which are due to the latter mentioned gentleman, for the respectful attention and consoling kindness he manifested towards the deceased in his last illness. When, "like the poor sequestered stag, that from the hunter's aim had ta'en a hurt," he had "come to languish" in Clifton, at a season when the "careless herd, full of the pasture, never stay'd to greet" their old associate, Mr. Maurice's services to him, were, especially in a pecuniary way, of the last importance. Though benevolent actions are, in a great measure, their own reward, even in the present life; yet, at the great assize, when every one will be judged "*according to his works*," such godlike offices as these, will, most assuredly, be duly appreciated.

"'Tis he who scatters blessings round
  Adores his Maker best;
His walk thro' life is mercy-crown'd,
  His bed of death is blest."

Mr. Maurice will, I hope, forgive this grateful tribute of profound esteem, from the hand of an entire stranger to his person, which thus gives publicity to deeds, that would modestly evade popular applause and the splendour of ostentation.

SILVANUS GIBBS.

Plymouth-Dock, July 16, 1813.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

The celebrated battle at Vittoria gave occasion not only for illuminations and splendid feasts, but for a thanksgiving to be addressed to the Supreme Being, in the places of worship occupied by the two great sects established by law in this kingdom. For the sect established in the southern part of this island, and in Ireland, a Form of Prayer was composed, and directed to be read by all its ministers: but, as in Scotland they do not use a liturgy, the ministers of the sect established by law in that part of the island, received orders only to offer thanksgivings for the victory obtained by the confederates in Spain, and were left to themselves to use the language which they thought best suited to the occasion. As a very great majority of the people of the United Kingdom does not frequent the places of worship of the two sects established by law, their thanksgivings on this account will be, if offered, quite spontaneous, and many will, from principle, be averse to use any thing of the kind in their religious meetings. In the form of thanksgiving, prescribed to this part of the kingdom, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is addressed under the title of Lord God of Hosts, and to him is ascribed the signal victory obtained over the French, at Vittoria, and the allied army is called on to prostrate themselves before him with one consent, and to acknowledge with humility of heart, that the victory is God's. The prayers, praises and thanksgivings on this account, are expressly declared to be offered to the Divine Majesty, in the name and through the mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ. Thanks to the Almighty for victories have been repeatedly offered, by all parties, during this calamitous war, and not unfrequently the same field of battle has given occasion to both sides to address the Majesty of heaven. How far this conduct is justifiable in 'those who are without,' it is needless to inquire; but the Christian will pause before he gives countenance to this practice, nor can he adopt it, unless it has the sanction of his Lord and Saviour. Our master teaches us to address his God and our God, under the title of Our Father, for all Christians are his children: and he teaches us to love our enemies, and to return good for evil: but not one word is said by him to encourage us to use his name for any victory obtained by force over our enemies. His apostles exhort us to pray for our sovereigns, that we may be peaceably and quietly governed, but they are equally silent on the subject of thanksgivings for successes over enemies, and unite with our master in recommending us to cultivate a peaceable and forgiving disposition, and to do all the good we possibly can, to those who hate, injure or persecute us. A meeting of Christians is consecrated to the God of love and peace. Every thing that has a tendency to divert the mind from the pursuit of these two great objects, is studiously to be avoided. The passions of men cannot be permitted to have any place in those assemblies, where the sons of God present themselves before their holy Father, and acknowledge themselves to be subjects of his beloved Son, whose kingdom is founded on peace and love and spiritual joy.

The Catholic Question continues to occasion considerable discussion, and two subjects have occurred since our last report, in connection with it, which are of high importance. The one respects the conduct of the Irish, who have determined on requesting the interference of the Cortez of Spain in their behalf. We do not mean to raise any objections to the application of persons in distress to a friendly power for its mediation with their sovereign: but the singularity of this application will be striking, when we consider the persons applied to, and the object wished to be obtained. The Catholics of Ireland desire to be placed on the footing of every other subject, and to this wish we cannot feel the least objection; but they apply to the

Cortez of Spain, whose first article is, that the Catholic shall be the only religion tolerated in their country. Now in this kingdom is the fullest toleration of the Catholic religion. Its chapels are numerous; its worship is undisturbed; it has public schools and colleges, for the education of its clergy and laity. They desire more than this, and, for this purpose, apply to the good offices of the Cortez, who would be shocked at the appearance of Protestant subjects in Spain, with any of these indulgences. We were in hopes, on the abolition of the Inquisition, that much was gained in behalf of religious liberty, and we do not despair of this being ultimately the case; but the real state of religion has been hitherto imperfectly known, and the approaches to Christian freedom are but slow. Though the Inquisition is abolished in Spain, very severe laws have been established to protect the Roman faith. Among them this is retained from the old laws:—"Heretics may be accused by any person, before the bishops or their vicars, who are to examine them in the articles of their faith and the sacraments, and on finding them to err in any thing which the Roman church holds, they are to endeavour to convert them, and draw them from the error by good reasoning and mild persuasion, and to pardon them on their return to the true faith But if they will not quit their obstinate judgment, they are to give them to the secular judges to be punished in this manner:—if the heretic be a preacher, he is to be burned with fire, so that he dies, and the same punishment is to be inflicted on those, who believe that there are neither rewards nor punishments in another world; and if a person countenance heretics, he shall be banished or kept in prison, and the goods of condemned heretics shall go to their children and dependants being Catholics, or to the king or the church, in case they have no children."

This being the case in Spain, though we doubt whether the laws would be put strictly in force at the present day, we are very glad that the Irish Catholics are making an application to the Cortez, and we hope that the request will meet with ample discussion. It surely will be inconsistent with the Cortez to beg for any favour for the Catholics in this country, which it will not grant to Protestants in Spain, and thus the negociation between the two countries will be attended with advantages to both. It would, indeed, be a pleasant strife, an αγαθη ερις, a holy emulation, which should do most for the benefit of their respective subjects. Of course, on the matter being proposed by Spain, England would naturally reply,—"Let all pains and penalties on the subject of religion be removed in your country, and then we will mutually discuss what farther can safely be allowed to dissidents from the established religion, and whatever you will grant to Protestant subjects in your country, that we will allow to Catholic subjects in our own." Upon this basis a Committee of Spanish Catholics, from the Cortez, and of English Protestants, from our Parliament, might lay down some principles which would approach nearer to the

Christian maxim of doing to one's neighbour what we wish to be done to ourselves, than any that are maintained at present, in either Catholic or Protestant states.

The other point resulting from the Catholic Question is likely to occupy the early attention of Parliament, at its next meeting. The Speaker, in addressing the throne at the close of the sessions, alluded, among other subjects, to the proposed Catholic bill, and speaking of it, he said.—"Other momentous changes have been proposed for our consideration. Adhering, however, to those laws by which the throne, the parliament and the government of this country are made fundamentally Protestant, we have not consented to allow that those who acknowledge a foreign jurisdiction should be authorised to administer the powers and jurisdiction of this realm; willing as we are, nevertheless, and willing as I trust we ever shall be, to allow the largest scope to religious toleration." Now a question arises here, whether the Speaker has given, in these words, a fair statement to the sovereign of what occurred in the House of Commons. A bill was proposed for relief to the Catholics, and all parties allowed that something should be done. In the discussion of the clauses, a difference of opinion took place, and a clause having been rejected by a very small majority, the proposers of the bill declined to go farther with it, intending, at the next sessions, to renew the subject! Nothing, therefore, can be said to have been done, but a disposition has appeared to make a great alteration in the laws, which are at present in force against the Catholics. Is the Speaker then right in his assertion, that the throne, the Parliament and the government of this country, are made fundamentally Protestant? Does he mean to say, that the legislature of this country is bound by any law, or by any controuling force, which shall prevent any decision on this head? It is to be recollected that the throne, Parliament and government of this country were, for many centuries, Catholic,—that they changed the religion then by law established, and introduced something between the then Catholic and present Protestant, which fixed by degrees nearer to the present opinions: and it was scarcely fixed, when the Parliament abolished all the new opinions, and re-established the Catholic religion. This lasted, however, only during a short reign, when, by the authority of Parliament, it was again removed; and the Protestant religion, again established, by the same authority, has remained, with occasional variations in its faith and worship, the established religion of the country. But in these changes we see nothing fundamentally established, nothing, in short, established that the legislature of this country cannot alter; and the Parliament of this country is as competent to establish by law any religion it pleases, as were the Parliaments of Henry the Eighth, Edward the Sixth, Mary and Elizabeth. Should the next session perceive that the foreign jurisdiction alluded to by the Speaker, does not interfere with the civil allegiance to the sovereign, and form a law suitable to the occasion, by which catholics shall be put on the same footing with their protestant fellow-subjects they will not be deterred by the insinuation that they are acting against any fundamental law in this kingdom; for a fundamental law must be prior to, or at least coeval with, the origin of parliaments.

The great measure respecting the Unitarians was not likely to pass without notice from that body, and the first public notification was from the Book Society, established in London, which had a meeting upon the occasion, in which several Resolutions were passed, expressive of their gratitude to the legislature, and their hopes that this is only a prelude to more enlarged views of toleration, and the restoration of all men, whatever may be their religious opinions, to the rights enjoyed by their fellow subjects. Mr. W. Smith was not forgotten, and the thanks of the meeting were voted to him in a manner that would fully meet his feelings, and be considered by the public as justly his due. This example is likely to be generally followed.

A curious case has arisen; which is likely to occasion much discussion in the established sect, and some inquiry into the state of the evangelical party in that sect. Two modes are established in this kingdom of licensing places of worship, the one for the established, the other for all the other sects. For the former, a peculiar set of ceremonies is performed by the officer called the bishop; and a clergyman cannot officiate in any public place of worship in which these ceremonies have not been performed, without incurring or exposing himself to the penalties of schism. For the other sects a simple registering of the place is sufficient. It appears that in the diocese of Chichester a clergyman has been officiating, and has a very respectable congregation in a place which the bishop has not set apart for this service, and being of the evangelical persuasion, he has fallen under the censure of some persons who think it right to animadvert upon this circumstance. They say, that the place must be licensed in one of the two ways above-mentioned, and it should seem that there could be no difficulty in the case. But the generality of our readers are not perhaps aware of the whole extent of this question. We do not know what is the state of the chapel, nor under what circumstances it was built, but as long as it is unconsecrated, it remains private property, and the moment the ceremony is performed, the land and buildings become part of the patrimony of the established sect, and the appointment of the minister must be made according to its rules. Hence this question is of no small importance; and it involves many chapels built upon speculation. If they are not consecrated, they are dissenting chapels, and the clergy cannot officiate in them; and to consecrate them would destroy the views of the speculators. We shall watch the progress of this question, which is likely to divide the evangelical clergy into two classes, to which in no short space of time appropriate terms will be applied.

The state of affairs on the Continent is not yet fully developed, but every thing leads or seems to lead to a cessation of the cruel warfare, which has so long harrassed the northern and middle regions. Bonaparte is still in Germany regulating his troops and his kingdom with his accustomed energy. The armistice is not broken and negociations are commenced for a general peace. The meeting of the delegates is to be at Prague, but every thing will most probably be settled by the respective courts before the assembly is held, which in fact will have little to do but to adjust the ceremonial of signatures. The Earl of Aberdeen is gone from this country in a public character, but what is his specific mission time must discover. The whole rests with the three powers, Russia, Austria and France: the secondary powers must submit to their determination. If they are agreed, then England will be left to continue the war by herself, and Spain is the only place for her exertions: and if they differ and Austria and Russia should join, another calamitous war will be the consequence. But the probability is that peace will be established between the three powers, with sufficiently advantageous terms to each; and if England enters into their views, new arrangements may be made with respect to Spain, which shall prevent that unhappy country from being any longer a bone of contention.

But the horrors of war, though assuaged in the North, have, on a smaller scale indeed, reigned in the Pyrenees. The result of the battle of Vittoria was the retreat of the remains of the French army into France, the advance of the allies to its borders, and the sieges of the two towns, St. Sebastian and Pampeluna. To relieve these towns was of great importance to the French, and with this view, Soult, their newly appointed general, exerted himself to the utmost in the levy of fresh troops in the south of France. On the other hand, the allies hurried on as fast as they could the sieges, but at St. Sebastian they were forced, and were obliged, after an immense waste of ammunition, labour, lives and men to give up, for a time at least, the undertaking. A breach had been made, which was deemed practicable, and an assault accordingly took place, with all the energy of the British character. This only increased their loss; for the French were too securely posted to be injured by the attack, and the allies were under the necessity of retiring, exposed to a dreadful fire from the enemy, who, by a sortie, aggravated their loss. At this moment, Soult was marching into Spain, and, with a large and well-appointed army, made an attack on the whole line of the allies. At first, he was successful in compelling them to abandon several of their posts, and a week passed in a succession of battles or skirmishes. The result of the whole was, however, that he failed in his attempt, being compelled to retreat, and the allied army reassumed very nearly their original positions. The loss on both sides was very great, but what, is not ascertained, for returns have only been made of the British and Portuguese; that of the Spaniards and French has not been given from authority. Prisoners were made on both sides, convoys were taken by the allies, but the French carried away with them four guns of the Portuguese, losing none of their own, as the nature of the country not permitting their usual manœuvres with them, they had been sent into France. The honour of these affairs rests with the allied army, which cannot expect to enjoy it long without interruption.

Spain has got rid of its Nuncio, whose interference in her domestic affairs could no longer be tolerated; and the Portugueze government has given a presage of no small improvement. The news has arrived, that that abominably wicked institution, the Inquisition of Goa, has been suppressed, and its buildings laid open to public curiosity. We are indebted to Dr. Buchanan for valuable information on this impious place, conducted with the same forms as those of ecclesiastical courts, but proceeding far beyond them in acts of cruelty. A long and tedious imprisonment may follow excommunication in this country; but the wretched convict is not debarred from social intercourse. If he loses the prayers of his sect, and languishes in a prison, this is prefarable to a dungeon, a *san benito*, and the stake.

The Mexicans support the standard of revolt with great energy, appealing to the example of the United States, and establishing their independence with manifestos, proclaiming the wrongs they have suffered from the mother country, and the rights to which they think themselves entitled. The form of their government is not clearly laid down, but whether regal or republican, their position will give them great influence in the affairs of the new world. The prospect of reconciliation with this country and the United States seems farther removed; and we are sorry to see symptoms of recurrence to customs which we hoped were become obsolete. In this unhappy war, where the contending parties speak the same language, difficulties arise in settling of what state a prisoner is the subject. According to what are called the laws of war, the subject of any country found in arms against it is liable to death; and some taken by us under this predicament are claimed by America as their subjects; and in case of punishment inflicted on them, retaliation is threatened. As a general law, that the subjects of a country taken in arms against it shall suffer death, nothing can be more absurd, and how can the principle be maintained in this country, which has in its army and navy men, we might almost say, from every nation under heaven! Humanity modifies this law in all countries, and it little becomes two countries which ought to set an example to others in improved civilization to be deficient in this virtue. But this wretched war portends more changes in the art, and the skill of the Americans promises to shew them not inferior to the natives of the old world in the trade of blood, the horrid arts of destruction.

⁎ Since the "State of Public Affairs" was written, the news has reached this country, that the period of the armistice has expired, that all negotiations between the belligerents are broken off, and that war is about to be carried on in Germany, on a more awful scale than has ever yet been witnessed. A million of men are in arms! We tremble to anticipate the devastation and slaughter which the future pages of this volume may have to record. ED.

CORRESPONDENCE.

We are much concerned to report the death of two eminent Unitarian Ministers; the Rev. *John Simpson*, of Bath, and the Rev. *Joseph Bealey*, of Cockeymoor, Lancashire.

The *Obituary* of Mr. *John Cross*, of Exeter, (whose sudden decease was announced on the Wrapper of our last number,) is excluded from this month's Repository by want of room: it will be brought into the next.

A Report of the Proceedings of the Trustees of the *York Academy*, at their Annual Meeting, held on Friday last, the 27th inst. at Manchester, is promised to us for a future number.

We must again intreat our correspondents to have patience with us; the length of some of their communications tries *our* patience not a little.

Our readers will see, upon inspection of our pages, that we do not insert *literary notices*: they are, in fact, *advertisements*, and belong to the cover. Some of the monthly publications have an article made up of them but the reason of the custom is obvious;—it serves as an occasion for interested puffs, profitable to editors and booksellers.

THE

MONTHLY REPOSITORY

OF

Theology and General Literature.

No. XCIII. SEPTEMBER. [Vol. VIII.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

Memoir of the late Rev. Hugh Worthington.

[We have already, through the prompt kindness of an able and much respected correspondent, given (p. 545—550) an Obituary of Mr. Worthington, but we are tempted, by our respect for his memory, to extract from another work, [The *Universal Magazine*] the following Memoir, which, as the signature will inform many of our readers, is from the pen of the *Rev. Jeremiah Joyce.* ED.]

The Rev. HUGH WORTHINGTON, son of a gentleman of the same name,* was born at Leicester, on the 21st of June, 1752, old style; or, according to the new mode of reckoning, which commenced in the following September, on the 2d of July.† He received the elements of education at home, entirely under the instruction of his father, and was distinguished, from a very early period, by the quickness of his parts, and the strength of his memory. At the age of sixteen, when he had, by the fostering care of an indulgent but vigilant parent, attained to a considerable knowledge of the classics and the Hebrew language, and also of the lower branches of mathematics, he went to Daventry, to pursue, under the late Dr. Ashworth,* those studies which are esteemed necessary to qualify a young man for the duties of the dissenting ministry—a profession to which he had devoted himself, with the consent and entire approbation of his father, on a conviction of its great utility. There are those living, who, as his contemporaries and fellow-students, were the witnesses of the early career of his studies for the sacred ministry, and who bear the most ample and decisive testimony, not only to the irreproachableness of his moral conduct, but who add, that his habits of industry, regularity, and almost incessant diligence, in the pursuit of knowledge were singularly exemplary. Independently of the learned languages, and the branches of sciences taught in dissenting-colleges, he spent much of his time in the study of the works of those divines who had flourished in the preceding century, and who were distinguished for their talents and zeal in the cause of Christian truth; and so satisfied was he of the vast importance of this kind of reading, that in his Address to the Students of the New College,† he says, "Let me exhort you frequently to read the practical writers of the last age. Some of their sentiments may not accord with your's or mine; but there is a fervour of piety breathing through all their works, which no modern improvements in knowledge or elegance can supersede, and which will be of infinite service to us, in all our prayers and discourses."

---

* The Rev. Hugh Worthington, A. M. died October 29, 1797, at the age of 86, having been pastor of a congregation of dissenters at Leicester, nearly sixty years. This gentleman was born at Balshaw-outwood, near Stockport, Cheshire. He was educated by Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Eaton, of that place, who, some time after this, removed to Nottingham. In 1734 he went to Glasgow, where he took his degree of M. A. He settled as dissenting minister first at Leeke, in Staffordshire; thence, in 1738, he removed to London, was chosen librarian to Dr. Williams's Trust, in Red-cross Street, and pastor to the society at Newington Green; and in 1741, or 2, he was unanimously appointed to succeed the Rev. Mr. Watson, at Leicester. He was author of a Funeral Discourse for the Rev. Mr. Dawson, of Hinckley: Three Charges delivered at the Ordination of young Ministers, of which one was at Salters' Hall, in 1782: an Address to his Countrymen, during the Seven Years' War; and a volume of Sermons on practical Subjects.—(See Protestant Dissenters' Magazine, vol. iv. for a Memoir of this gentleman.)

† The Gregorian, or *new style*, was invented by Pope Gregory XIII. The difference between the *old* and *new* style is this: the former is calculated on the supposition that the length of the year is 365 days, 6 hours; but the latter is reckoned according to the true length of the year, which is only 365 days, 5 hours, 49 minutes. In the year of Christ, 200, there was no difference of styles; but, in 1580, the difference was 10 days, hence Pope Gregory ordered that, in all Catholic countries, these days should be taken out of the calendar, and that, for instance, the 1st of January should be called the 11th, and so on. This alteration did not obtain in England till 1752, when the difference was 11 days; and, by Act of Parliament, it was ordained that the mode of reckoning should be so far altered, that the 3d of September should be called the 14th; of course the 21st of June would be reckoned the 2d of July.

Mr. Worthington, while a student at Daventry, was likewise a great reader of sermons: he was well acquainted with the merit of all the writers who were distinguished in this sort of composition: he did not read them for mere amusement, but for the purpose of imbibing in his own mind whatever was excellent in Tillotson, in Clarke, in Bates, in Seed, in Jortin, and many other preachers, in and out of the pale of the established church. It was his custom on each returning Sunday, before he was himself called to the pulpit, not only to attend the duties of public worship, with the most religious punctuality, but to peruse six or eight, or sometimes more, sermons with so much care as to be able on the next day, to give from memory, a luminous view of the subjects treated on: an analysis of the arguments by which all the duties had been enforced, and the doctrines illustrated and defended, and to state with that accuracy and precision, for which he was ever remarkable, all the practical inferences deduced by each author from the topics discussed. By this method, and with the aid of his most retentive memory, he laid up stores of knowledge, peculiarly adapted to his future usefulness as a preacher.

---

* Dr. Caleb Ashworth was born in Lancashire, in 1709, was a student under Dr. Doddridge, and eventually his successor. He died in July, 1775. See a Sermon on the occasion of his death, by the Rev. Samuel Palmer, who mentions that Dr. Ashworth had desired that no character might be given of him: ' But," says Mr. Palmer, "if it had not been for this prohibition, nothing more needed to have been said, than that he was the immediate successor of the illustrious Dr. Doddridge, and was nominated by him to this office" Mr Worthington in his Memoir of Mr. Crabb, to be noticed hereafter, says, "Dr. Ashworth was a man, who, though not distinguished by that acumen of genius and vigour of imagination, which some have possessed, yet by strong sense, inflexible resolution and indefatigable labour, acquired a store of theological learning, not often exceeded, and through a long train of years discharged the office of Divinity Tutor, with a respectability and a success, which have seldom been equalled."—Dr. Ashworth was author of three single Sermons: a Collection of Psalm Tunes, with an Introduction to the Art of Singing: a Collection of Anthems: an Hebrew Grammar: an easy Introduction to Plane Trigonometry, of which an enlarged edition was published, in the author of the *Scientific Dialogues*, by 1802.

† See a Sermon preached at the Old Jewry, May 6th, 1789.

When he had been at Daventry the usual course of five years, he was chosen assistant tutor in the classical department, but in the interval between the completion of his own studies, and the commencement of his duty as tutor, he came to London, on a visit to his friends; and being invited to assist some of them in the pulpit, his fame instantly spread, and he was regarded as the most popular preacher among the class of Dissenters in which he had enrolled himself. Scarcely had he commenced the business of classical tutor, when he was invited to become assistant preacher at Salters' Hall, in connection with the Rev. Francis Spilsbury, who had been pastor to the congregation assembling there, for more than thirty years.

Mr. Worthington accepted the invitation, and began his services at Salters' Hall, on the 1st of January, 1774, having succeeded to that place by the resignation of the Rev. Hugh Farmer, the celebrated author of treatises on the "Temptation of Christ in the Wilderness:"—on "Miracles:"—on the "Dæmoniacs of the New Testament;" and on "The General Prevalence of the Worship of Human Spirits in the Antient Heathen Nations."

The youthful preacher instantly drew crowds to hear him; and though the duties which he performed were those of the afternoon, the place was always full, and the hearers attentive and serious. He had, from his first appearance in the pulpit, in his manner and in his discourses, that kind of eloquence which arrested the attention, and which effectually prevented the listlessness and langour that are too frequently observable in afternoon congregations. The popularity which he acquired at the outset of life, never once deserted him.

He appeared before the public as an author, for the first time, in the year 1775, when he published, at the desire of his hearers, a sermon which he had preached on the 28th of May, entitled "A Good Character better than a Great Fortune."

On the 1st of January, 1778, he was called to preach a sermon for the benefit of a charity-school, which had been established nearly a century in Gravel-lane, Southwark. This sermon was published; the subject is "The Progress of moral Corruption," from the words of St. Paul;—"Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." He considers the text as a *proverbial saying*, very common at the period when used by the apostle, and shews its application to states, churches, families and individuals. With regard to the latter, he points out in a forcible manner, that it is by no means a matter of trivial importance, whether we guard the avenues of the heart, or indulge the early risings of vice, and hence he infers that persons should eradicate as quickly as possible, the first appearance of evil.—" Either," says he, " we must conquer this, or it will get the mastery of us. If the weeds are not extracted from a corn field, they will soon overpower and destroy the grain. He that yields to a small temptation, little suspects what mischief and ruin he brings upon himself: that every compliance strengthens the force of seduction, and diminishes the native vigour of the mind; that habit increases by indulgence, and a three-fold cord is not easily broken; that familiarity with sin utterly extinguishes the love of God, zeal in his service, and delight in his ordinances; and where the love of God is extirpated, or devotion sinks into formality, the agency of his holy spirit is withdrawn, and a man is left to struggle by himself, amidst the tossing waves of appetite, and the dreadful rocks of temptation—like a ship torn from her cable. Is it any wonder, that in such a case, we descend to actions the very name of which would formerly have petrified the soul with horror?"

On the 5th of November, in the same year, he preached a sermon, to the supporters of the Sunday Evening Lecture at Salters' Hall,* which was very soon after published, under the title of " Christianity, an easy and liberal System; that of Popery, absurd and burdensome." The object of this discourse was intended to excite in Protestants a horror of the principles of Popery, and it was certainly well calculated to answer the purpose. We believe, however, and, indeed, are very sure; that the principles of the present race of Roman Catholics are very different from those which five-and-thirty years ago, the preacher confidently ascribed to them, adding in his animated language, which the writer of this perfectly remembers to have heard, " We must be strangely ignorant of Popery, if we do not know that religious persecution is essential to its nature. And could it once get a footing in this kingdom again, you might read, by the *light* of *Smithfield fires*, the truth of what I have asserted."—We will venture to affirm that, had Mr. Worthington been called to a like office, in the latter years of his life, he would not have so treated the Catholics, nor have imputed to them, as he then did, in the language of Bishop Burnet, a "pleasure in *doing* what *Protestants* cannot *bear* to *hear*." He would probably look back upon this discourse with emotions of concern and regret: it should, however, be observed that the zeal manifested by Mr. Worthington, on this occasion, was not at all peculiar to him, it was almost the general characteristic of the age.

---

* This lecture was carried on several years, by Mr Worthington, in conjunction with the Rev. Dr Rees: and it was customary for the preachers on every alternate 5th of November, to deliver a discourse on the subject of Popery. On the 5th of November, 1779, Dr. Rees preached an excellent sermon, " On the Obligation and Importance of searching the Scriptures, as a Preservative from Popery," which was published, at the request of the Society

When Dr. Rees resigned his connection with the lecture, the Rev. Thomas Morgan, and the Rev James (now Dr.) Lindsay, were chosen to carry it on with Mr. Worthington. Mr Morgan, on the 5th of November, 1799, preached an interesting sermon, on " The Predicted Stability and Permanence of Christianity, illustrated by historic testimony." This admirable discourse, which is full of historical information, was published at the desire of the supporters of the lecture.

In the year 1780, Mr. Worthington published "An Essay on the Resolution of Plane Triangles, by common Arithmetic; with a new and concise Table adapted to the Purpose;" which as it must necessarily be of very limited application in mathematical pursuits, was not, it is presumed, much inquired after. As, however, this little tract is not generally known, it may be right to mention, that it is divided into three sections: the first contains an enumeration of the principal rules for the resolution of plane triangles, without recurring to tables of sines, tangents or secants: in the second, the author shews the grounds on which these rules are built; and the third is principally devoted to the explanation of the nature of the table mentioned in the title-page. An appendix contains some equations intended as *formulæ* for the solution of triangles.

About this time, or, perhaps, a year or two before, he announced, as preparing for publication, "A plain Account of Fluxions, in which the Doctrine of Conic Sections, and the Problems of Natural Philosophy are omitted; for the Use of Learners." This work, which was afterwards mentioned by the author among his actually existing publications,* was never given to the world, and probably never printed.

The Rev. Francis Spilsbury, whom Mr. W. denominates his "father in the gospel," died, after a short illness, on the third of March, 1782. On this occasion Mr. Worthington delivered an Oration at his interment, in Bunhill Fields, and he likewise preached a Sermon, on the following Sunday, both of which were published. Of these the former is the most striking, pathetic and impressive. In both he speaks with the utmost respect and affection of his deceased friend; but it ought not to be passed over without notice, that though he had been an assistant preacher with him more than eight years, and on terms of such intimate friendship, that he exclaims, in the discourse just mentioned,—"I have lost the guide of my youth, to whose counsel I had always access, and beneath whose fostering wing I have reposed for years;" yet he could not tell the congregation what were his sentiments on disputed and important doctrinal points. Notwithstanding the respect due to the character of Mr. Spilsbury, as a practical preacher, and a pious and exemplary character, still it cannot redound to his praise, that he preached to, and lived among a people forty years, as this divine did, and yet leave his hearers, and most intimate friends, ignorant of opinions on interesting theological topics.

At the age of seventy-six, it should seem, according to Mr.

---

* See the last leaf of the Ordination Services, printed in 1782.

Worthington's account, a matter of doubt whether Mr. S. were attached to the doctrines of Calvin or Arminius, whether he was a Trinitarian or an Arian, for no one, at that period, would suspect him of the species of Unitarianism, which admits only of the simple humanity of Christ.

On the death of this gentleman, who was universally respected, and who, "instead of amusing the flock of God with things of a trivial nature, or perplexing them with those of a controversial kind, insisted upon plain practical subjects,"* Mr. Worthington was chosen to succeed to the pastoral office, and on the 15th of the following May was, with Mr. Robert Jacomb, ordained. The service was performed at Salters' Hall; and the principal officiating ministers were the Rev. Dr. Kippis, who preached from the words of the apostle Paul, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ:" the Rev. Dr. Rees, the Rev. Michael Pope, and the Rev. Hugh Worthington, senior, who delivered a charge, founded on the words, "Make full proof of thy ministry," which contained a number of excellent observations and much good advice. The Sermon and Charge, together with the questions put by Mr. Pope to the candidates for ordination, and their respective Answers, which were, in general, liberal† and manly, were published.

In the summer of this year, Mr. Worthington married Susanna, the eldest daughter of the Rev. Samuel Statham, of Nottingham, a lady in whom were united an excellent and cultivated understanding, and a mildness of manners and disposition, adapted to render the marriage life a state of mutual comfort and happiness. By her he had two daughters, both of whom died within a few hours of their births. This amiable and excellent lady, after a long illness, died in the month of March, 1806.

Very early in the year 1786, a plan was formed to establish an academical institution, in the neighbourhood of London, for the education of ministers and others. Mr. Worthington was one of nine persons selected as a Committee to consider and arrange the means for carrying the plan into execution. An appeal was made to the Dissenters at large, for their approbation and pecuniary assistance in the promotion of this scheme. Several thousand pounds were, in a short time, subscribed; tutors were chosen; and the lectures commenced in the month of September, 1786, at the library in Red-cross Street.

Mr. Worthington undertook the classical department, with which were connected the study of logic and other branches of knowledge. He attended, during that session, three times a week, and also twice or thrice a week after the college was opened at Hackney. In the spring of 1789, he sent in his resignation, to which he was compelled, he said, "by the great increase of students, and the pressure of his own personal concerns."

---

* See the Funeral Sermon above referred to.

† Mr. Jacomb was a few years morning preacher at Salters' Hall: he afterwards removed to Leicester, as assistant to the Rev. Hugh Worthington, senior, whom he afterwards succeeded, as pastor to the society. Mr. Jacomb, in his answers referred to, avowed himself a believer in the horrible doctrine of the Eternity of Hell Torments, a doctrine from which the mind of his colleague, at Salters' Hall, was ever abhorrent.

Previously to his quitting the connection, he was called upon to preach the Annual Sermon before the supporters of the institution. To this sermon, which was published, we have already had occasion to refer.—The object of it was to recommend the "Union of Knowledge and Goodness," which he observed, "comprehends every thing we can conceive of, as amiable in the nature and attributes of the Deity." In comparing the present state of the country with what it had formerly been, he says,—"Many writers have taken upon them to condemn the present age, without reserve, because they can trace among us some vices which had little or no appearance in the last century, or possibly at a much later period, when they themselves were children. But these persons forget that virtues and vices, like sea and land, often change places with each other, though they cannot exchange natures. In one place the sea trenches on the land, and swallows up a large tract of it; but then, in another, it retreats just as much, and leaves a valuable portion of solid ground. So in one century, vices spring up, which in the preceding were scarcely observable; and on the contrary, those which formerly prevailed and were enormous, now almost disappear. And if we compare the present state of this country, with what historians record of its manners under the reign of Charles II. shall we not discern, that in his time, this nation had more drunkenness, obscenity and profaneness than now? But on the contrary, is there not, in the present day, a spirit of refinement, dissimulation and luxury gone forth, which enervates both the moral and political body? The former assailed the temple of virtue by storm, the latter secretly undermines the foundation. From these things it surely appears, that an exact estimate of the virtue and vice of any country is a calculation which requires many data. Whoever praises or condemns the age he lives in, in an unqualified manner, or, as we usually say, in the gross, entirely misses the truth, and exposes his own weakness."—He then proceeds to shew in what respects the world is better than it formerly was: that the arts and sciences have been more cultivated: the laws amended: war is conducted with less cruelty: the spirit and power of the Inquisition have declined: and liberty, civil and religious better understood. Yet he would not compliment the age with a character for greater *seriousness*, compared with what it had been, unless, said he, "you include the instances wherein it is wretchedly disfigured by the nonsense of enthusiasm." The preacher goes on to speak, with just and becoming indignation, against the *apathy* of those who "profess religion, but understand nothing about it: who are decent, because not tempted by their connections to be profane: who are Dissenters or members of the Establishment, just as their fathers were before them."

"Now, from this apathy," says he, "many are awakened; but it is to enthusiasm, absurdity, blind zeal and superstitious worship. They hold *doctrines* which are irrational and contemptible, and which make religion the object either of disgust or of terror: doctrines which, if true, would rob the Deity of his glory, for they infringe upon justice, and annihilate mercy; doctrines which, by representing God as partial, serve only to make one man proud and another despairing; in a word doctrines which necessarily transfer all our obligations of gratitude, love and confidence, from the Father of spirits to some other being. Their want of charity is, if possible, still worse than their creed. Blessed be God, we live in times when they cannot proceed to the cruelties of a Bonner, or a Jeffries; they cannot erect a scaffold, or light the faggots. But though they may not burn the bodies, they consign over to damnation the souls of all who differ from them in speculative opinions. Yes; were the keys of the kingdom of heaven lodged in their hands, not a single Christian would be suffered to enter that state, who could not pronounce 'Shibboleth' as they do. And what are the *preachers* they follow? Men of such total ignorance, that they rail at learning, and call reason carnal, though God gave the one, and appointed the other. Men, who build a system of divinity upon a figure, an allusion, a detached word or two; who quote the scripture by sound, instead of sense; and who strain the types of the Old Testament till every judicious Christian blushes, and every infidel triumphs. In short, men who, with violent rant, distorted countenance and ridiculous gesture, convert the pulpit into a stage of buffoonery."

The discourse from which these extracts have been taken, is, in many respects, extremely valuable; and though the Institution, in behalf of which it was composed and delivered, has long since dropped, yet the sermon should not be forgotten. It ought neither to be buried with the institution, nor with its author.* Those who assume to themselves the care of his reputation, would do well to reprint it, together with that "On the Progress of Moral Corruption;" and, perhaps, some others that will redound to his credit as a rational and impressive preacher.†

---

* Mr. Worthington, in this discourse, p. 39, laments that the situation of a London minister excludes the important duty of catechising children, who are usually sent into the country for education. Catechising children, however important, is not to be compared with another, too much neglected, duty, viz. that of lecturing young people on doctrinal subjects, and, more especially, on the evidences of natural and revealed religion. "The period," says Mr. W. "from fifteen to twenty is a season of great danger, and for learning the most valuable things, it includes the best five years of any man's life." Now London abounds, more than any other place, in subjects of this age, and ministers would do well to fix their attention on topics of serious and vital importance, and thus draw them from frivolity, and guard them from vicious propensities, to which there are numberless temptations in this great city. Some preachers, like Mr Worthington, and his first colleague, in the Evening Lecture, still occupying a highly important place in the church, can, by their peculiar talents, interest the feelings and direct the views of young persons to subjects of rational enquiry, by means of their pulpit discourses only; but, in general, this object will be best attained by familiar lectures.

† The writer of this article would be glad to see, in print, a series of five Discourses on a Future State, which he

In the year 1795, Mr. Worthington drew up a brief but interesting Memoir of his late friend and fellow student the Rev. Habakkuk Crabb, which was prefixed to a volume of posthumous sermons published for the benefit of the author's orphan children. In this Memoir, Mr. Worthington speaks with becoming indignation, of the treatment which his friend had met with, from one of the congregations with which he had been connected, "because he preferred scriptural language to human phrases," contrasting their behaviour with the kindness and liberality which he afterwards experienced, "in a serious, enlightened and affectionate congregation at Royston, an ASYLUM perfectly adapted to his wishes, and where he continued till his death." Those who remember Mr. Crabb, will not fail to connect the name of Nash, with the happiness which the deceased minister enjoyed, during the latter years of his life.

In 1796, he became morning preacher at the chapel of Hanover Street, Long Acre, and continued his services several years, so far as those services were compatible with the pastoral duties at Salters' Hall. And, upon his retiring, the congregation presented him with a piece of plate, of the value of sixty guineas as a token of respect and gratitude, for the benefits which they and their families had derived from his ministry among them.

Mr. Worthington's father died, in the year 1797, at the advanced age of eighty-eight; the son had, some years before edited a Volume of his Sermons, and upon his decease he wrote a Biographical Memoir, that appeared in the Protestant Dissenters' Magazaine, and also in the Monthly Magazine, for the month of November, in the same year. In this memoir were promised an additional volume of his father's sermons, and a more full and enlarged life of the venerable man. That he did not perform this act of filial duty, was, we have been informed, on account of some family reasons, which he did not think it necessary to explain.

Mr. Worthington was a considerable adept in the art of Short-hand writing, and had employed much of his time in improving upon the system which he had learnt in early life. He had studied the subject with great care; at one time he had made considerable progress in a work upon it, and had caused several plates to be engraved, with the view to a publication on strictly scientific principles, but the book has never been given to the world.

In December, 1805, Mr. Worthington published a discourse, which he had preached on the day of thanksgiving, appointed to commemorate Lord Nelson's victory, obtained over the combined fleets of France and Spain, on the 21st day of the preceding October.

In the beginning of this sermon, he laid down four preliminary cautions, viz,—that amidst all our rejoicings, there must be no pride or self-conceit:—no malignity against enemies:—no inhuman delight in war:—and no presumptuous confidence as to futurity. He next specified some of the great things which God has done for this country, and, inde-

---

remember to have heard Mr. Worthington deliver, full thirty years ago, first in the afternoon, and then at the evening lecture.

pendently of victories over our enemies, we have reason, he said, to be very grateful for *our insular situation: — our climate: — our commerce :—our attainments in science and literature:—and our privileges, with regard to civil and religious freedom.*

In speaking of the death of Lord Nelson, he says, "The Eternal Disposer of events has, on this occasion, most awfully proclaimed the truth, *that he is alike able to save and destroy.* Interesting lesson! In the very moment of victory, he has withdrawn the instrument by which he wrought it; unnerved the arm which had just been directing the British thunder; and for ever closed the eye, which day and night used to watch over our safety and happiness."

In adverting to the religious improvement that national mercies demand, the preacher exclaimed, "The man that will not sincerely and ardently pray for his country, deserves not to breathe its air: let him go to a clime, the atmosphere of which is as frigid as his own soul."

Mr. Worthington published some other sermons, to which the writer of this article has not access: one of these was preached before the "Corresponding Board, in London, for erecting Schools, and propagating the Gospel in the Highlands:" another was a Sermon preached in behalf of the Charity-school in Wood Street, Spital Fields.

His avocations, as a pastor of a large congregation, were numerous and frequently pressing: he was likewise engaged in several public trusts: of the Presbyterian Fund he was an active member: and at Salters' Hall he had preached more than forty sermons, in recommendation of that excellent charity: he had also preached, for the same purpose, at the chapels in Princes Street, Westminster; Hanover Street, Long Acre; Leather Lane, Holborn; perhaps, likewise at other places, and upon these occasions the collections were always considerable. Mr. Worthington, was a patron to the Orphan Working School, in the City Road; and he had been one of the trustees to Dr. Williams's estates and library twenty-eight years.

For many years, previously to his decease, he had been afflicted with ill health, which probably prevented him from those extra exertions, in the way of literature, which, in many cases, seem not only compatible with the profession of a dissenting minister, but which are likely to augment a minister's happiness, by rendering him more independent of the people among whom he labours. A dissenting minister, to be useful in the highest possible degree, to say nothing of his own personal ease and comfort, should *be*, and *feel* perfectly independent of his hearers, nor suffer himself to be dictated to, as to the doctrines which he thinks it his duty to promulgate and insist upon. He has, in general, a better opportunity for pursuing speculative enquiries, than those who attend upon his ministry, because he is enabled, by the support which he derives from his office, to devote a considerable portion of time to enquiries connected with his profession, and he should claim, as his right, the utmost freedom in stating the progress of his convictions; for if a man be cramped in this respect, he will feel himself in trammels not easily endured.

The subject of this article was, unquestionably, as far as pecuniary matters were concerned, perfectly independent, and could have quitted the connection in which he was, without in the smallest degree deranging his domestic comforts; yet his habits were such that he could not, or, probably, thought he could not, quit his station at Salters' Hall without hazarding his future peace and happiness, and therefore endured, for a considerable time, that sort of interference to which we have alluded, but not without deeply lamenting it. He felt there were persons of weight and consequence, in his congregation, who were suspicious that his sentiments were not so sound as they ought to be, or as they used to be. This fact is not mentioned with the smallest ill-will to any individual; the writer scarcely knows the persons whose names have been mentioned in connection with it, and is certainly not sufficiently known to any one of them, to take the liberty of offering the commonest salutation in passing them in the street; but he is induced to make the remark, knowing what Mr. Worthington felt on the subject, and in order that the hint may be useful to other persons who stand in similar relations.

In the case of Mr. Worthington, the suspicion was perfectly groundless: few men ever changed their religious opinions less than he He began life an Arian,* with regard to the person of Christ; and was from his first entrance in the pulpit avowedly inimical to the gloomy doctrines of Calvinism. That he was not in the least careful to conceal these opinions all his stated hearers can testify. As far back as the year 1777, the writer of this article can look,

In proof of Mr. Worthington's zeal for the doctrine of Arianism, we may observe that, in 1789, he devised a plan to stop the progress of Unitarianism, which he and others, by a misnomer, denominated Socinianism. A meeting was held at Chapel House, Oxfordshire, which consisted of, the Rev. H. Worthington, of London; the Rev. B. Carpenter, of Stourbridge; the Rev. H. Crabb, of Cirencester; the Rev. Mr. Geary, of Beaconsfield, and one or two others. Previously to the assembling of this synod, it was determined that one was to write a dissertation on "The Person of Christ;" another on "The Personality of the Holy Spirit; a third on "The Atonement," and so on. Unfortunately, the subject of INSPIRATION was started, and it was found, that the reverend divines, who were about to crush Priestley, Lindsey and others, could not agree among themselves on this, which was regarded as the fundamental point from which they were to set out. After three days debate the meeting was dissolved, and the several individuals, it is believed, separated from one another, very much dissatisfied with their performance. The actors in it were afterwards always shy of speaking on the subject.

---

* Of Mr. Worthington's class-fellows at Daventry, two, viz. the Rev. Edward Dewhurst (see an account of this gentleman, in the memoir of his very extraordinary son, vol. vii. of the Monthly Repository,) and the Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, were originally, like himself, Arians. Mr. Dewhurst continued in the same faith, till his death, and Mr. Carpenter is almost the only person who, of late years, has thought Arianism worth defending, by means of the press.—(See vol. ii. &c. of the M. Repository.) The others, viz, the Rev. Mr. Fawcett, of Yeovil, and the Rev S. S. Toms, of Framlingham, were Calvinists when they went to Daventry, but are now decided Unitarians in the strict sense of the term.

and he well remembers, that though the sermons of this favourite preacher were uniformly practical, yet he not unfrequently found occasion to give what, at that time, his hearer esteemed severe and fatal blows, in the same discourse to the Trinitarian and Socinian; and at others he did not deal less severely with the doctrines of Calvinism and Philosophical Necessity. It must be much more than 30 years ago, that he heard him with a delight, of which the impression is not obliterated, descant on the latter subjects, when discoursing from the pathetic exclamation of Christ, "Oh Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered together your children, &c. BUT YE WOULD NOT."

To within a fortnight of his death, Mr. Worthington, though worn down with disease, and labouring under a pulmonary complaint, was the same animated preacher that he had ever been. When employed in the pulpit, he forgot himself and his bodily infirmities, and had no other feeling but the desire of being useful.

After the last public service in which he engaged, on the 11th of July, he left London for Worthing, in the hope of being benefitted by a change of air. Occasionally he felt partial amendments, but he almost uniformly thought that he was rapidly hastening to the end of his journey, of which he gave intimations to several of his friends. On Sunday, the 25th, he attended public worship, and retired to his chamber at the usual hour. About five o'clock on the following morning he was seized with an expectoration of blood; he had strength enough only to warn his friend of his sudden indisposition. They came in a few minutes to his bed-side; he was composed and cheerful; but upon the hope being expressed that he would soon find himself better, he replied, with his usual emphasis, "No, never: I now feel as I never felt before." Soon after, he uttered his last words, "*Gracious Father, forgive me, and receive me to thyself;*" and in a very short time he died without a groan or struggle.*

His body was brought from Worthing to his house in London, and in the evening of the 5th of August it was removed to Salters' Hall, the principal scene which had been witness to his labours for forty years within a few months; from thence it was taken on the next day to Bunhill Fields, and interred in the same vault that contains the remains of Mrs. Worthington and other branches of his family. The funeral service was performed by the Rev. Thomas Tayler, and the whole was conducted at the expence of the congregation. Eighteen mourning coaches and several private carriages followed the hearse; and there were, probably, not less than two thousand spectators in the burying-ground, of whom many, no doubt, assembled from motives of curiosity, but others, and those the larger number by much, attended for the purpose of paying a tribute of respect to the memory of the deceased, and to mark, by this feeble but sincere testimony, how much they were affected by the loss of him who had occupied, so usefully, a most important post in society.

---

* For several weeks it was believed that Mr. Worthington had died without a will, it is however now certain that he executed one, only two or three days before he left London for Worthing. He kept a Diary, written in a short-hand of his own, which was an improvement upon Palmer's method, and in that diary he says he had signed his will, on a given day, and that, to prevent *accidents*, a copy would be found, attached to certain letters. The copy has been found, and though in short-hand, will, it is hoped, prove a legal instrument.

On the following Sunday, an eloquent and very pathetic funeral sermon was delivered to the congregation by the Rev. Dr. Lindsay, which, we trust, will be given to the public. The Rev. Henry Lacey, the morning preacher at Salters' Hall, preached on the same occasion; as did the Rev. John Evans,* at Worship-Street. The Rev. Thomas Belsham, of Essex-street chapel, referred, in a sermon, with regret, as well for the public, as himself, to the loss of his very old friend and fellow student. Dr. Toulmin, in a discourse preached on the same day, at St. Thomas's Meeting, in Southwark, did not fail to improve the solemn event: and an occasional preacher, the Writer of this Memoir, at the Old Jewry chapel, in Jewin Street, who had been one of Mr. Worthington's pupils, at the close of a discourse from the words selected from the book of Job, "*If a man die, shall he live again?*" introduced the following observations:—

"Some of us, in the course of the last week, have seen committed to the cold and cheerless tomb, the remains of one who had been forty years distinguished as a popular and most useful preacher in this city. His death would not, I am sure, have passed unregarded in this place, had the health of your excellent and venerable pastor allowed him to have occupied, at this moment, his own pulpit. I pretend not to supply the deficiency which his absence necessarily occasions. I feel that I am wholly unable to do justice to those talents, which I look back upon with respect and the most unfeigned regard, yet I will not pass by the circumstance entirely in silence.

"The death of Mr. Worthington cannot fail of exciting emotions of sensibility in the breasts of those who have witnessed his exertions in the pulpit, and who have been instructed by his discourses. Since he became a preacher in the metropolis, a new generation has sprung up, on whom his public labours must have had a considerable effect in forming the moral character. There was a peculiarity in his manner, as well in his prayers, as in his sermons, which was entirely his own, which none could imitate, and which, if it did not accord with a correct taste and refined judgment, was remarkably striking and impressive, and particularly adapted to the sententious style of his compositions.

"The devotional parts of his services were well calculated to awaken in the thoughtless, and to animate in the serious part of his audience, those devout and grateful feelings which are essential to acceptable worship. His sermons were instructive, plain, scriptural, and adapted to the young.—Almost all of them abounded with short and energetic sentiments, that might be treasured up in the mind as striking and important axioms, easily remembered, and of great practical utility in life. What he uttered, seemed to come from the heart, and instantly made its way to the hearts of his hearers. He interested persons of all ages, but the young were particularly captivated by that earnestness and zeal which he ever displayed in recommending to their attention the duties of religion.

---

* The interesting sermon, preached by Mr. Evans, entitled, "Usefulness the great Object of the Christian Ministry," to which we invite the attention of our readers, is published by Sherwood and Co. Paternoster Row.

" With what ardour did he, from the commencement of his public ministry, warn others still less advanced in the progress of life than himself, against the seductions of vice!—In what striking colours would he exhibit the folly and danger of those who did not, as far as it was possible, avoid the enticements and company of those who had lost their own character, and who were running down the road to destruction. He studied the human heart, and was quick in the application of his knowledge to the purposes of moral instruction. Hence he was perpetually urging those just embarked on the dangerous ocean of life, to mark with a firm and steady opposition, the earliest allurements intended to draw them from the path of rectitude: to be satisfied with such pleasures as were simple, innocent and manly; such as a benevolent Creator had appointed to cheer the path of life; and to have recourse to them always as a recreation, not as the main business of existence.

" He frequently and successfully exhorted young persons, in every sphere of life, to keep their eyes constantly fixed on some object that required activity of mind and energy of thought, and that might prove useful to themselves, or beneficial to others: he did not cease to admonish them, that history had transmitted no name to posterity with honour, that had not sacrificed pleasure to duty—that had not on important occasions, proved its magnanimity by self-denial, leaving the application to their own reflections.

" There are those living who recollect with pleasure, who remember with gratitude, impressions made by the discourses of Mr. Worthington, much more than thirty years ago; to which they willingly impute any little ardour they themselves have evinced in life, in the cause of virtue and sound knowledge. He, we may venture to assume, now that he is no more, seldom or never pleaded in behalf of the interests of religion in vain. By his exhortations he has warned multitudes from rocks, that would have wrecked their frail barks: he has enabled them so resist or subdue the gay passions of youth, and to put a decisive negative to the seductions of those who had themselves fallen victims to the fatal snares of unlawful pleasure.

" By means such as those, which have been very feebly described, few preachers have been more useful; and very few, as preachers, will be longer remembered. By the impressive style of his preaching, he excited in many other persons, intended for different pursuits, a desire of becoming ministers of religion, and then readily and generously assisted them in attaining the object of their wishes. Out of pure friendship, and the desire of being useful, he has opened the road to several, and to others he has granted, or obtained for them, those aids in the way of instruction, which could not have been procured elsewhere, without any hopes, any expectation, or even any, the most distant chance of remuneration in this world.

"Of these, not one it is believed will think upon his exertions, his labours of benevolence, without emotions of gratitude; not one who would not rejoice to be situated as I, at this moment am, with the opportunity of acknowledging in public, and before a most numerous and respectable congregation, how much he is indebted to his kindness and liberality.

"Of these many are filling useful and important stations in the church; and some, one at least, who either from the want of proper talents, or from other circumstances, to which he cannot allude, without risking the charge of egotism, having been denied the place in society, which from early life he anxiously sought, is not wholly useless, in that particular way for which the late Mr. Worthington was greatly celebrated, viz. in guiding the steps of the young into the temple of knowledge. If a train of circumstances which, after all, he has no reason to regret or be ashamed of, has deprived him of what he long esteemed, and still regards, as one of the most important and useful stations in life, that of a public teacher of the Christian religion, he cannot reproach himself with any great share of inactivity: if denied the opportunity of labouring in the cause of virtue and the promotion of true knowledge, on the first day of the week, he is teaching by his works, humble as they are, not a few on the other six. It affords him some consolation to know, that he is not wholly useless; that the gratuitous labours of his deceased friend, whose remains he, uninvited, with many others, affected by the loss, followed to the grave, have not been entirely thrown away.

"Can we think of such a man, as him to whom I have directed your thoughts, or rather to whom all our thoughts are almost naturally impelled, and yet with respect to him, and to others like him, who are actively engaged in training their fellow creatures to virtue, ask the question in the text, '*If a man die, shall he live again?*' To unassisted reason, he seems gone for ever; his place knoweth him no more; and hereafter there will be no remembrance of him, nevertheless, he will live again; and many shall rise with him, and call his name blessed. Yes! the glorious gospel, of which he was so useful and eminent a preacher, has, we fear not to assert, made it as certain that we shall all live again, as it is certain that we must die; and then we shall put away those imperfections which, in some degree or other, attach to us all, or by a course of discipline more or less severe, shall be fitted for an inheritance among the just." J. J.

Highgate, Aug. 17, 1813.

Historical Account of the Warrington Academy.

(Continued from p. 433.)

The erection of the new range of lodging rooms had involved the institution in a debt of 1700l, to provide for which, a number of the Trustees, in the year 1770, engaged to furnish 100l. each, and to take the premises in mortgage for their security. Of course, instead of being, in a pecuniary view an advantage, they were an additional burden upon the funds of the institution.—In other respects the affairs of the academy went on without much interruption, with the three tutors, Messrs. Aikin, Holt and Enfield, and Mr Rigby, the provider of the commons, till the death of Mr. Holt, in the beginning of 1772. Of this gentleman very little information has been obtained, in addition to what is given in p. 4. He is said to have been a man of remarkably mild and gentle manners, and of an equanimity almost unparalleled; insomuch that he appears to have been scarcely capable of emotions, at least of any violent kind; to have been, in short, a sort of reasoning automaton. By what process of education he was formed to this, we have no account of his early youth to enable us to judge. When he was at Glasgow, it is reported of him that he took a walk, during one of the vacations, along the ridge called the English Apennines, till, passing along that branch of it which terminates in Rivington Pike, he came to the height which looks down upon the vale of Bolton. From hence he sent a boy to summon his brother, with whom he held a conference, and then, without descending, turned about, and marched back to Scotland. His equanimity of mind, joined to his exact mathematical precision, gave him a great advantage in argument on metaphysical subjects, his acquaintance with which was very extensive, and of his judgment, concerning which his colleague, Dr. Aikin had a very high opinion. He was particularly exact in requiring a precise previous definition of terms made use of by his adversary; which frequently put an immediate end to the dispute. It is said to have been a sentiment of his, that he could live happy in perfect solitude, to all eternity, meditating on the perfections of the Deity.

A correspondent, to whom the writer is under great obligations, and who was one of his early pupils, does not recollect his ever being under any difficulty for illustrations in his class. Probably, like many eminent mathematicians, he might not always make sufficient allowance for the slow apprehensions of beginners, and without regarding the difficulties which he might not himself perceive, might be too apt to introduce them, prematurely, to the most abstruse parts of a science, of which it requires considerable comprehension of mind to relish even the elements. However this may be, his class was certainly not a popular one; perhaps no mathematical tutor, who is wise, will expect to make the subjects of his course as generally interesting as those of his colleagues in the business of education: in the present instance, as has been already observed, some rather impertinent hints and suggestions on the conduct of his class, appear in the Minutes of the Trustees; which it must have required all his *sang froid* to receive with complacency, and which his successor certainly never would have borne.—He left a curious mathematical will, which excited much remark, and occasioned some perplexity, by which he bequeathed his property to his relations, in proportions, regulated by their respective degrees of proximity, without mentioning a single name, even that of his wife, who was supposed to have contributed her full share towards saving what he had to leave, and who survived him a good many years on a trifling income.

Mr. Holt was succeeded by the Rev. George Walker, F. R. S. of whom so full a biographical account has been prefixed by his Son, to his Posthumous Sermons and Miscellaneous Works, and so many tributes of respect to his memory have been inserted in the Monthly Repository, (vol. ii. p. 217, and vol. v. pp. 217, 475, 504,) that nothing further occurs to be added on the present occasion. The situation could not fail to be particularly agreeable to a man, who was not only of distinguished eminence in his own particular department, but also of great attainments in various walks of general literature, and almost unrivalled in his talent and taste for literary conversation. The emoluments, however, arising from the fees of his class, were far from answering either his expectations or his wants; and, nothing being to be expected from the funds of the Academy, a removal from his present situation, was, to a man lately married, with the prospect of an increasing family, a measure not of inclination, but necessity. He accepted an invitation to Nottingham, in the summer of 1774.

After several ineffectual attempts to supply Mr. Walker's place, the funds being quite unequal to the offering of an adequate salary to a successor, Dr. Enfield, as has been stated, undertook the herculean task of qualifying himself, in a single vacation, under the direction of his friend Dr. Clayton, of Liverpool, to add to his former, already arduous, department, that of tutor in the mathematics and natural philosophy; Dr. Aikin relieving him from the logic and higher classics. And in consequence of Mr. Rigby's about the same time declining his situation as provider of the commons, Dr. Enfield added this also to his other cares, with little expectation of profit, at the rate of 17*l.* the session of ten months.

About this time a very pleasing addition was made to the opportunity of general information enjoyed in this institution, by the voluntary undertaking of Mr. (now Dr.) Aikin, then a young surgeon lately settled in Warrington, to give, at his own risk, to those who chose to attend him, short courses of lectures on anatomy and physiology, and on chemistry; designed to introduce into these studies those young gentlemen whose profession would require a further attention to them, and to give such a general knowledge of them to others as belongs to a course of liberal education. Something of this kind had been occasionally attempted before; Dr. Priestley, who could turn his hand to any thing, informs us in his Memoirs, (p. 43,) that "he one year gave a course of lectures on anatomy;" and a course on chemistry had been given more than once, by Mr. Matthew Turner, an eminent apothecary and chemist in Liverpool, who was the first that prepared in the large way for sale, and introduced into general practice, the sulphuric æther. The former course must necessarily have been very imperfect; and though to the latter the philosophical world is under great obligations, as it gave Dr. Priestley his first ideas on the subject of chemistry, (Mem. p. 56), yet the mere circumstance of Mr. Turner's distant residence and various engagements required that the subject should be condensed into as few lectures as possible, and prevented frequent repetitions. It was therefore a great advantage which the students for many years enjoyed, of having these lectures regularly repeated, in alternate sessions, by a gentleman fully acquainted with his subject, to whom, and to his colleague, Dr. Enfield, may be applied, with great justice, what Johnson has said of Goldsmith,—"*Nihil tetigit quod ornavit.* The course of anatomy consisted of fifteen or twenty lectures, that of chemistry of about thirty. For the use of those who attended the former he drew up a "Sketch of the Animal Economy," which he afterwards translated into elegant Latin, with a particular view to lead students in medicine to pay more attention to the acquiring of a correct Latin style; for the latter, he published "Heads of Chemistry," a neat synopsis of the doctrines and facts then known, but now, of course, out of date; and translated Baume's Manual of Chemistry.

Perhaps this may be as proper a place as any to mention, that, after the departure of Dr. Reinhold Foster, various unsuccessful attempts were made to engage a foreigner in the capacity of teacher of the modern language—a M. Fantin la Tour, a M. Le Maitre, alias Mara,* and a Mr. Lewis Guery; but none of them continued for any length of time. At length, the Trustees resolved to engage Mr. Hulme, an English gentleman, who had resided abroad, who continued to teach French, and also fencing, to such as chose it, till the close of the academy. It is believed that he still resides in Warrington.

The business of the academy went on from 1774 to 1778, the two tutors continuing to perform the work of three, till, as has been mentioned, in p. 170, Dr. Aikin found it necessary to resign the classical department, and Dr. Enfield was very desirous to have got rid of the office of *Rector Academiæ*, and the providing of the commons. After several unsuccessful negociations, Mr. Houghton, just then leaving the academy, was engaged to assist Dr. Aikin for a year, and in 1779, the Rev. Gilbert Wakefield, B. A. was chosen to fill the classical department. Of this eminent scholar so complete an account has been given by himself and by the respectable continuators of his biographical Memoirs, that the present writer has only to add his own grateful recollection of the pleasure and advantage derived from his instructions. His observations on the classical writers whom he read with his pupils, were delivered in a somewhat more familiar style than those of his venerable predecessor; and consisted more of verbal criticism, illustrated (as in his Notes on Matthew, and his *Sylva Critica*) by the production of a great variety of passages where the same *word* is used by other authors, rather than (as was more frequently the case with Dr. Aikin) where the same *sentiment* is expressed. The divinity students were under particular obligations to him for voluntarily undertaking, after Dr. Aikin's death, a course of Lectures on the New Testament, nearly the whole of which he read over with them, and thus contrived, in a most useful and acceptable way, to fill up their time during the remainder of the session.—In conjunction with Dr. Enfield and Mr. Aikin he also established (as he has related in his Life) a sort of classical club among the Students: but though several very excellent papers were read in it by the gentlemen above mentioned, which have since instructed the public under various forms, it did not flourish like those mentioned in the life of Dr. Enfield, probably from the extreme inequality of its several members, in point of classical attainment, which necessarily precluded the younger members from being any thing more than listeners to the *dicta* of their seniors.

---

* There is great reason to believe that this was the infamous Marat, the associate of Robespierre, and the victim of Charlotte Corday. It is known that he was in England about this time, and published in London a Philosophical Essay on the connection between the Body and the Soul of Man, and, somewhere in the country, had a principal hand in printing, in quarto, a work of considerable ability, but of a seditious tendency, entitled "Chains of Slavery." Mara, as his name is spelt in the Minutes of the Academy, very soon left Warrington, whence he went to Oxford, robbed the Ashmolean Museum, escaped to Ireland, was apprehended in Dublin, tried and convicted in Oxford under the name of Le Maitre, and sentenced to the Hulks at Woolwich. Here one of his old pupils at Warrington, a native of Bristol, saw him. He was afterwards a Bookseller in Bristol and failed, was confined in the goal of that city, but released by the Society there for the relief of prisoners confined for small sums. One of that Society, who had personally relieved him in Bristol goal, afterwards saw him in the National Assembly in Paris in 1792.

On Dr. Aikin's death, the Rev. Nicholas Clayton, D. D. of Liverpool, was prevailed upon to become his successor in the theological chair. But as several circumstances remain to be cleared up respecting this excellent person, I must claim your indulgence for another short paper, in which I propose to finish what I have to report of the tutors at Warrington, and offer a few remarks on the causes of its failure.

I am, &c.

V. F.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Book-Worm.—No. VIII.

Sir, *Aug.* 13, 1813.

The following pamphlet is still curious on account of the personages in the title-page, though the subject of the correspondence has been exhausted by the discussions of the last century:

A Letter against Popery: particularly against admitting the Au-

thority of Fathers and Councils in Controversies of Religion; by Sophia Charlotte, the late Queen of Prussia: being an Answer to a Letter written to her Majesty by Father Vota, an Italian Jesuit, Confessor to King Augustus. 1712.

This Letter was originally, I apprehend, in the French language. The translator and publisher appears, from his Life (B. B. vi. 3973,) to have been *Toland*, who, at the close of a prefatory dedication *To the Lady E, G.* anagrammed his name into *Londat.* He has chosen an appropriate motto from the Æneid (xi. 688.) where the heroine *Camilla* thus addresses a Tuscan whom she had mortally wounded.

> Nomen tamen haud leve *Patrum*
> Manibus hoc referes telo cecidisse Camillæ.

Thus correctly, though not elegantly, rendered according to *Trapp*, with a slight variation for the present purpose:

> Yet to thy *Fathers'* shades,
> This solace, no small glory, shalt thou bear,
> 'Tis to Camilla's dart thou ow'st thy death.

Sophia Charlotte is distinguished among a family, the princesses of which have, at different periods, discovered an attachment to literature and liberal theology. Queen Caroline's attentions to Clarke and Whiston are well known; and to the late princess Amelia, her daughter, Father Courayer delivered, as an acceptable present, the "Declaration of his last Sentiments," published in 1787, and in which he has maintained the proper Unitarian doctrine. Nor should Elizabeth, Princess Palatine, aunt of Sophia Charlotte, be forgotten, who is mentioned by Penn, in his "*Travails* in Holland and Germany, 1677." In her conferences with Penn and his associates, she displayed much religious curiosity and a serious inclination to their opinions. Dr. Kippis, in his additions to *Barclay*, (B. B. i. 601,) says of this princess, that she "had a high regard both for him and all the Quakers, and carried on a frequent correspondence with him," and that "many of her letters are preserved in the Barclay family. Two of her letters to Robert Barclay, besides one which she sent to her brother Prince Rupert, intreating him to use his interest for putting a stop to the persecution of the Quakers, and one from Barclay to *her*, written with a singular spirit of piety and simplicity, are printed in *A Genealogical Account of the Barclays of Urie.* Aberdeen, 1740."

The Queen of Prussia was sister of George I. and grandmother of Frederick III. who has mentioned her more than once, with great regard, in his *Memoires pour servir a l'Histoire de Brandenburg.* She was admired and sought in marriage by Louis XIV. but reasons of *policy*, perhaps of *Protestantism*, interposed. *On la destinoit pour le trône de France; Louis* XIV. *fut touché de sa beauté, mais des raisons de politique firent echoüer ce marriage.* Memoires ii. 31.

They could be reasons of policy alone which united Sophia Charlotte and Frederick I. to whom she was married in 1684, at the age of 15. His grandson says of him, that he founded an *academy* in complaisance to his consort, and hired *buffoons* to please himself.

In another place, he describes Frederic I. as persuaded to found an academy because it became his *royalty*, just as a young squire, in regard to his station, should possess a kennel of hounds. The courts of these ill-matched consorts were, as might be expected, quite separate, and that of the Queen worthily distinguished by purity, learning and politeness. *C'etoit un temple où se conservoit le feu sacrè des Vestales, l'azile des savans, et le siege de la politesse.* Id. 96.

Toland, on the accession of Queen Anne, became politically obnoxious to the court of London, apparently on account of his zeal for the succession in the house of Brunswick. He now travelled to the Continent, passing some time in Hanover and Prussia. There, according to his Life before quoted, he was frequently entertained by this Queen, to whom he is understood to have addressed, in 1704, his *Letters to Serena.* It is mentioned in Toland's Life, (B. B. vi.) that "Mr. L'Enfant heard him read a discourse concerning prejudices to Sophia Charlotte, before whom, at Charlottenburgh, he had a dispute with Mr. Beausobre, another of her chaplains, 'on the authority of scripture.'"

In his Preface to this translation, Toland says, on his own knowledge, that Sophia Charlotte "spoke several languages to such a degree of perfection, as made strangers call in doubt which might be her first. Her favourite subjects were divinity and philosophy; but she often used to wish they could be managed with less interestedness, passion and partiality. She gave every body a good example herself, by affording an equal ear to all the parties engaged, and in never failing to hear, with extraordinary calmness, those absurd and frightful consequences with which they used to charge each other."

Her grandson Frederic, who himself highly admired the character of Leibnitz, describes his grandmother's attachment to that philosopher, who resided, with other learned men, by her invitation, in her court at Charlottenburgh. She is said to have remembered Leibnitz on her death-bed, in connection with the metaphysical subjects of their conversations, thus consoling one of the ladies of her court who bewailed her: *Ne me plaignez pas. car je vais, à present, satisfaire ma curiosité sur les principes des choses, que Leibnitz n'a jamais pû m'expliquer, sur l'espace, sur l'infini, sur l'etre, et sur le néant.* Mem. p. 32.

Sophia Charlotte died at Hanover, on a visit to her mother the electress Sophia, Feb. 1, 1705, in the 37th year of her age, recommending, in her last moments, the learned whom she had patronised, and the arts which she had cultivated, to the protection of her brother the Elector, afterwards George the First. Nor was this recommendation ill-addressed, if, as I have somewhere read, George I., after he was raised to the British throne, had so much regard to his own improvement as to invite literary and scientific men to a weekly evening party, at his palace, where it was the established rule to take no special notice of the king, but to afford him the advantage of being treated as a man.

Dr. Towers, in his Memoirs of Fred. III. (2d. ed. i. 97,) relates from Pollnitz, that "M. de la Bergerie, the minister of the French Church, who assisted Sophia Charlotte in her last moments, was so surprised at her courage and calmness, that he was more attentive to hear her than to exhort her. 'I have,' said she, 'for twenty years, seriously sudied my religion, and have read the books that treated of it with too much application to be in any doubt as to my principles. You cannot mention any thing to me but what I have read, and what you can say to me will certainly add nothing to my opinion.'" Dr. T. adds, that "this princess had formed ideas of government so equitable, and so extremely different from those which prevailed in Prussia, that she was often styled by the Germans *the republican Queen.*"

Such was Sophia Charlotte. Her correspondent, Father Vota, appears, by Frederic's Memoirs, to have visited the court of Prussia, in a political character, from his master the King of Poland. After a long prefatory address by Toland, the correspondence commences (p. 26) by "Father Vota's Letter to the Queen of Prussia." This letter, which is short, is dated March 3, 1703, from Stargard in Pomerania. The Father, who appears to have been now an old man, thus refers to his disputes in the Queen's presence with her chaplains:—"There still remains with me a very sensible displeasure against myself; because the obligation under which I lay to defend the honour of the first fathers of the Church, has drawn upon those gentlemen, whom otherwise I esteem and honour, answers that were proportionable to the great wrong they did to the whole primitive church, before it was divided into parties." He adds, "I flatter myself, however, that those worthy persons will still continue my good friends, as I do for them preserve a very sincere esteem, being incapable of retaining any resentment from which in reality I am exempt in the greatest warmth of disputation."

"The Queen of Prussia's Answer to Father Vota" is not dated, but was probably written on the receipt of the Jesuit's letter. After a return of compliments, Sophia Charlotte adds, "What has made the greatest impression upon me in your letter is the nice concern you shew about the little skirmishes in which you were engaged with my chaplains. Herein I discover the character of a well-bred man and a Christian, which adds no small lustre to the rare qualities of your mind. I can say as much to you on the behalf of these gentlemen, and promise that in this respect, there will be no controversy between you." The Queen proceeds, in the following passage, to describe government in Prussia more favourably than according to the opinion I have quoted from Dr. Towers. She also compliments *Protestantism* with an attachment to free inquiry, a character yet but partially deserved.

"I am not in the least surprised that, in a very small space of time, you have heard a world of things spoken in a country of liberty, which in a country of authority you should not have heard in forty years: for they are indeed two several countries, where very different languages are spoken. But if I may freely declare my opinion, I can pretty well inform you what it was that insensibly led those gentlemen to forget the decorum of the fatherhood in their expressions about the fathers. As among us Protestants, men are accustomed to look upon the holy scriptures as the sole rule of faith, by which both fathers and councils are to be examined; they were not well satisfied, to be sure, that in this whole affair you attributed so little to scripture, and that you spoke in so disobliging a manner of reason, whose authority alone ought to prevail in the world, and to which you yourself have so great obligations. However, as people may continue good friends, and yet every one persist in his own sentiments, they very positively maintain, that they have advanced nothing concerning the Fathers and the Councils that has not been said and published many times before, not only by the authors of our communion, which you are not bound to acknowledge, but likewise by Roman Catholic authors, and, what surprises me most, even by Jesuits."

The Queen, to prove her point, refers to the censures passed upon Augustine by the Jesuits Adam and Annat. She then describes her chaplains as maintaining, "that we cannot rely for the sense of scripture upon authors that have explained it so negligently, and that have spoken of the apostles themselves with so little respect as did St. Jerome." On the character of councils the Queen quotes Gregory Nazienzen as calling them *those meetings of cranes and geese, that wage a cruel war against each other.*

The letter closes with an apology for having thus "embarked on the ecclesiastical ocean." Referring to her chaplains, the Queen professes to have "trusted to the sincerity of her pilots." Yet, according to Toland, she was of herself competent to such discussion; for he declares, that "she had read every article in Bayle's Dictionary." Sophia Charlotte concludes with good wishes for Father Vota, and a hope, never realized, to see him again at Berlin, where she promises that he will "always find minds disposed for the search of truth."

Mr. L'Enfant appears to have been Sophia Charlotte's favourite chaplain. Observing that he had dedicated his *Histoire du Consile de Constance* to her son Frederic William, who had just succeeded to the throne, in 1713, I was curious to observe if he had cherished the memory of his royal mistress on so fair an occasion. The dedication consists of the usual compliments to *Protestant* princes, but of Sophia Charlotte there is no recollection. She had been dead eight years; and courtiers, even court chaplains, understand that *a living dog is better than a dead lion.*

Messrs. L'Enfant and Beausobre have been long known to Biblical students, by their valuable Introduction to the Prussian Testament, an English translation of which has been reprinted by Bishop Watson in his Theol. Tracts. (iii. 101.)

VERMICULUS.

Mr. Belsham's Reply to the Rev. H. Horsley.

SIR,

Among other *facts* which the learned prelate avers, "being supported by the authority of Mosheim," he relates (Lett. vii. Sect. 5,) that the majority of Hebrew Christians, having divested themselves of the form of Judaism, which to that time they had borne, they removed from Pella, and other towns to which they had retired, and settled in great numbers at Ælia" Dr. Priestley, however, not having been able to discover any traces of this return from Pella, in all his researches into ecclesiastical antiquity, nor yet in Mosheim's General History of the Church, plainly taxes the bishop with being the inventor of this circumstance of the narrative. But the learned prelate conscious that in this particular he had not advanced a step beyond his great authority, Mosheim, indignantly repels the charge of his acute, but too precipitate, antagonist. "It happens," says the bishop, "that this fact, of which Dr. Priestley does me the honour to make me the inventor, is asserted by Epiphanius." Tracts, p. 416. And again, p. 417. "To this assertion of Epiphanius, Mosheim, relating the fact, refers. Relating the same fact, to Mosheim I referred: to the very passage where Dr. Priestley, had he known what it is to examine authorities, before he pronounces upon them, might have found the reference to the original author. The confidence with which he mentions this as a fact, forged by me, is only one instance out of a great number, of his own shameless intrepidity of assertion."

Passing over the wrathful expressions of the indignant writer, let us now attend to the passage in Epiphanius, which the right reverend prelate has cited at length, and which, for reasons sufficiently obvious, he has cited in the original language, without a translation. The following is the purport of the passage. That Aquila, residing at Jerusalem, as overseer of Adrian's works, in the twelfth year of his reign, "saw the disciples of the apostles flourishing in the faith, and working great miracles of healing, and other wonderful things. For they had returned from Pella of the Decapolis, to Jerusalem, and were teaching. For when the city was about to be taken by the Romans, all the disciples were forewarned by an angel to withdraw from the city which was about to be utterly destroyed. These having withdrawn from Jerusalem resided in the aforesaid Pella, a city beyond the Jordan, but after the desolation of Jerusalem returning as I said, they performed great miracles." *Epiphan. de Pond. et Meus. Sect.* xv.

Now Sir, it appears undeniably from this passage of Epiphanius, and still more from the context, that these holy men whom Aquila saw, who were returned from Pella, and who were preaching and working miracles at Jerusalem, in the twelfth year of Adrian, were the very same persons who, warned by an angel, had escaped from Jerusalem, previously to its desolation by Titus, forty-seven years before, according to Epiphanius's own calculation. Dr. Horsley adds, that they returned from Pella, "after the demolition of Jerusalem by Adrian:" and that "they made no scruple to renounce the Mosaic law, that they might be qualified to partake in the valuable privileges of the Ælian colony." Tracts p. 174. The canonized bishop of Salamis relates who these returned emigrants were, and how they were employed, and the uncanonized bishop of St. Asaph states, with equal confidence, the chronology of their return, their renunciation of the Mosaic rites, to which they had been attached from their infancy, and the worthy motive, by which these primitive and orthodox brethren, were induced to this extraordinary conduct. And that which two bishops have affirmed, who will presume to dispute?

True it is, that the reviewer of this controversy, not having the fear of episcopacy before his eyes, and not sufficiently adverting to the gravity of the case, did amuse himself a little at the expence of these holy brethren, who at their advanced time of life, could be induced to shake off all their established and fondly cherished habits, and to take so fatiguing a journey, for no other purpose but to enjoy a few municipal privileges at Ælia: yet, learning from such high authority, that this was the object of their choice, he expressed his satisfaction at the information communicated by the veracious bishop of Salamis, "that these venerable members of the primitive church at Jerusalem, recovered from the fatigues of their march, and that, at the time when Aquila saw them, they were all flourishing in faith, teaching and working miracles in abundance."

This unhallowed remark upon these pious veterans, seems to have irritated the reverend prebendary's feelings beyond their usual point of ebullition. "Whether," says he, "Mr. B. was restrained by any *prudential motive* from making these observations on the reasoning of bishop Horsley, during that prelate's life, is probably known to Mr. B. himself; but I will venture to assure him, that the bishop, were he now alive, and possessed of all his youthful ardour, would not deign to take the smallest notice of them. Even I, however inferior to him, will not condescend to make a serious reply to such a tissue of petulance and absurdity." Tracts. p. 587.

What the pious prebendary could possibly mean, by the expression, *prudential motive*,—whether he conceives that his right reverend father might be suspected of a disposition to lift either the spiritual or the secular arm against the impugners of his high authority, is, perhaps, *known to the worthy prebendary himself*: to Mr. B. it is utterly inconceivable: and the reverend gentleman may rest assured that Mr. B. was deterred by no consideration of that kind, at any time, from exposing the ludicrous absurdity of the bishop's hypothesis.

But it seems that the reverend prebendary will not, and he vouches that his learned parent, if he were living, would not *condescend* to reply to such a *tissue of petulance and absurdity*. The worthy prebendary's resolution is much to be approved, and the *prudence* of his motives cannot reasonably be doubted. But, though he will not reply, he will condescend to retort. And his success in irony bears a just ratio to his triumphs in argument.

As the foundation of his retort, the reverend gentleman rakes up a silly story of the English Unitarians having made some application to the ambassador of the emperor of Morocco, in the reign of Charles the Second. And he further remarks, that the English Unitarians have published an Improved Version of the New Testament in the reign of George the Third. Hence he concludes, that upon the principles of the Reviewer of the Controversy, the Editors of the Improved Version must be the very same persons who applied to Ameth Ben Ameth, in the reign of Charles: and, consequently, that these venerable personages were no less than *one hundred and thirty-eight* years of age, when they accomplished their work of *correcting*, as he expresses it, the *oracles of God.*

Upon this ingenious parody the reverend prebendary expends much of his labour and his wit, and triumphs, not a little, in the happy conceit. It is much to be regretted, that its prolixity renders it inconvenient for transcribing. It may be found at page 588 of his new publication. And so well is the reverend gentleman satisfied with it, that he expects to receive the thanks of the reviewer for thus eking out his argument. In fact, there is only one circumstance wanting to render the parallel and the triumph complete; and that is, that some Unitarian bishop should be found, like the prelate of Salamis, to affirm, that the Unitarians who petitioned the Mahometan ambassador, in the reign of Charles the Second, were the very self-same individuals who taught religion, and worked miracles, and published Improved Versions, in the reign of George the Third. Till this event occurs, and till another saint, like St. Epiphanius, rises to illuminate the Unitarian church, let the worthy prebendary know, that his comparison halts in its main support: that his sarcasms are misplaced; and that it will be prudent for him to reserve his wit, I had almost said his buffoonery, to a more favourable opportunity, lest it should, unluckily, recoil upon himself.

Far different, but equally unsuccessful, was the learned prelate's mode of extricating himself from the fatal error of "relating that upon the authority of Mosheim, which Mosheim related upon none." The instant he consulted the passage in Epiphanius, the bishop must have seen that it was nothing to his purpose; but what could he do? He had, most *intrepidly*, asserted the return of the orthodox Hebrew emigrants from Pella, renouncing the rites of the law: and when charged with inventing the story, he appealed to Mosheim, and Mosheim refers to Epiphanius. But the account of Epiphanius is too fabulous in itself, and too irrelevant to the subject to be relied upon for a moment. How then does this accomplished master of Aristotelian and Baconian logic grapple with this difficulty?

In the first place the bishop states it, point-blank, as Epiphanius's assertion, (Tracts; p. 416.) that "the Hebrew Christians, after Adrian's settlement of the Ælian colony, returned from Pella, whither they had retired from the distresses of the war, to Ælia." But to what war Epiphanius here alludes, the bishop leaves his readers to guess.

Secondly, The learned prelate, from *prudential motives* no doubt, sets down the whole of Epiphanius's testimony in the original Greek, that his readers might possess it, pure and unadulterated, *without note or comment.* And though he refers to Epiphanius's work, he *judiciously* abstains from citing the chapter.

Thirdly, he states that it is "a matter of no importance," whether this return took place "at the end of Titus's or of Adrian's war; it is sufficient that these returned Christians were residing at Jerusalem, or, more properly, Ælia, at the same time that Aquila was residing there."—And, finally, he enters a very earnest caveat against chronological cavils.

All, however, would not do. His acute and indefatigable opponent pushes his advantage to the utmost; demonstrates the futility of Epiphanius's testimony, and compels the bishop, however reluctantly, to abandon these holy and orthodox emigrants to their fate. And when he proceeds, p. 419, to state the direct evidence "that a church of Hebrew Christians, not adhering to the rites of Judaism, actually existed at Ælia," passing over, with very slight notice, the assertion of Epiphanius, which if at all worthy of credit would have been most applicable to his purpose, he chuses to derive his proof from Jerome, whose testimony the learned prelate "thinks more convincing than that of Epiphanius." The testimony of Jerome, as the reader may remember, is to this fact *alone*, that in his time there were certain "Hebrews, who believed in Christ." This forms the seventh and concluding step of the bishop's famous demonstration of the existence of the Hebrew orthodox church at Ælia. But if this flimsy testimony of Jerome was, in Bishop Horsley's estimation, *more convincing* than that of Epiphanius, what must he have thought of Epiphanius's testimony?

In truth, the bishop himself, in his last publication, gives up the testimony of Jerome, as well as that of Epiphanius. His words, (Tracts p. 549) are remarkable. —"St. Jerome's evidence goes BARELY to the proof, that a body of orthodox Christians of the Hebrews was actually existing in the world much later than in the time of Adrian. St. Jerome's evidence is brought for the proof of this proposition SINGLY." And again, p. 551, "The existence of these orthodox Hebrew believers, in the time of St. Jerome, being thus proved by St. Jerome's evidence, the probability of the fact, that they resided at Ælia, and that such a body had been settled at Ælia from the time of Adrian downwards, RESTS UPON MY SIX FORMER POSITIONS." These six positions, the attentive reader will remember, were six gratuitous assumptions: and that they were not always judged by the bishop to be equal to the hard duty which he now imposes upon them, will appear from the learned prelate's own words, Tracts, p. 419. "It may seem that my six positions go no further than to account for the disuse of the Mosaic law, among the Christian's of Palestine, upon the *supposition* that the thing took place: and that they AMOUNT NOT TO A PROOF that a church of Hebrew Christians, not adhering to the rites of Judaism, actually existed at Ælia. To complete the proof I might appeal to Epiphanius—but I will rather derive the proof from a fact which I think more convincing than the testimony of Epiphanius. I *will rest the credit of my seventh position* upon the mention which occurs in St. Jerome's Commentary upon Isaiah. of Hebrews believing in Christ, as distinct from Nazarenes."

Thus, then, we are first informed that the six positions *not amounting to* a proof of the actual existence of this famous Hebrew church at Ælia, the testimony of Jerome is necessary to *complete the proof.* But we are now told "that the testimony of Jerome being alleged *barely* and *singly* to prove that a body of orthodox Hebrew believers existed in his own time, the probability of the fact, that such a body had been settled at Ælia from the time of Adrian downwards rests upon the six former positions." Had any one but that great master of dialectics, the Bishop of St. Asaph, made use of such reasoning as this, he would have been ridiculed for arguing in a circle. But, no doubt, had the learned prelate been living, he could have explained the consistency and established the validity of his own logic: a task which now devolves upon the reverend prebendary. In the mean time, readers who pretend to nothing more than common understanding, will naturally conclude, that if this *giant in controversy* may not, as the Quarterly Review asserts, be able to vanquish his mighty antagonist, he is fully competent to confute himself; and that the learned architect of the Hebrew orthodox church at Ælia, has completely demolished the foundations of his own favourite edifice.

I am, Sir, &c.

T. BELSHAM.

Mr. Wright on Evangelical Preaching, in Reply to J. H.

June 18, 1813.

SIR,

Your letter in the Repository for April last, (p. 249,) requires to be noticed by me. In the passage you have quoted from my Journal, it was not my intention to bring a charge against any minister, much less, as you have supposed, one that should be generally applicable; but simply to state what I understood to be a fact. So far from censuring the truly excellent persons, whose names you have mentioned, what I have seen of their works has afforded me pleasure and profit, and I highly respect their memory. As to the fact I stated, I believe I am far from being singular in thinking, that, till lately, "a dry, ethical mode of preaching" much prevailed. I agree with you, that it is not necessary ethical or moral preaching should be dry; but is it not likely to be so, if not associated with the facts, doctrines and motives of the gospel, which give life and force to every moral precept? I admit that doctrinal preaching may also be dry, "especially when it is interlarded with metaphysics," and its practical or moral application is not brought into view. But is it not possible so to unite doctrine and precept, in public discourses, that the doctrine shall enforce the precept, and the precept exhibit the moral use of the doctrine; and that these combined shall inform the judgment, warm the heart, and produce the best moral effects? Are there not proofs of the practicability of this in the valuable labours of many worthy ministers of the present day? You, Sir, will admit, that right views of Christian truth are of high importance; that they have a powerful bearing on moral improvement. But how are such views to be communicated to our hearers, unless we state and explain the facts and doctrines of the gospel? It is not by incidentally mentioning, nor by indirectly bringing into view, the doctrines of truth, that men will be convinced of error or led to true scriptural knowledge. Certainly, we should never attempt to build doctrines on detached texts, nor teach them as mere dogmas: yet, it may not be improper to refer to a number of texts, to shew what is the current language of scripture on a particular subject, provided the passages referred to be complete sentences, and neither figurative nor ambiguous. Though it appears to me most consistent and best calculated to do good for a minister fully to declare what he believes to be the truth of God, I am very far from taking upon me to say, which will be the best mode for him to adopt in his particular situation, to bring his hearers to the knowledge of it; yet surely it must be his duty to do all that he can to bring them to the knowledge of the truth. No doubt, "those ministers who preceded the present generation of Unitarians had judiciously and effectually prepared the way for them." They had done it by producing candour and Christian liberality in their congregations, and by teaching them that Christianity is a system of moral excellency. Some of them had done abundantly more: by their writings on theological subjects and labours in the field of controversy, they prepared the way for what Unitarians are now doing. It is readily admitted they laboured, and we have entered into their labours. The question is not whether the mode of preaching formerly adopted by some of the worthy ministers who preceded the present generation of Unitarians, and which certainly in many instances produced good, was the most proper at that time; possibly, it was the only practicable plan they could adopt to effect any good in some situations: but whether it would be either proper and beneficial, or otherwise than injurious to the cause of truth, to continue it in the present day? Whatever might be the state of things and the mode of preaching adopted among our brethren in Lancashire and Cheshire formerly, I rejoice, and I believe you rejoice with me, that "Unitarianism is now preached among them as the doctrine of the gospel, and evangelical righteousness established on evangelical principles." With best wishes for the success of the labours of the ministers and the prosperity of the churches in the before-mentioned district, I am, Sir, very respectfully, Yours, &c.

R. WRIGHT.

On Humility.

Sir,

Having remarked how earnestly and repeatedly Jesus Christ points out to his disciples his own example of *humility*, and being well convinced that humility is a necessary foundation both of goodness and of happiness, I have attempted a short description of the valuable fruits which naturally spring from Christian humility: and shall be very glad, if you think it worthy of being admitted into the Monthly Repository.

The Fruits of Humility.

The humble Christian is candid, gentle and patient; forbearing and forgiving; compassionate, kind and generous; sincere, grateful and obliging. He is submissive and resigned to the will of God; contented, cheerful and very happy. He is prepared to enjoy every blessing of kind Providence with the greatest advantage. He is safe in prosperity and full of comfort in adversity. Envying none, he is delighted at seeing others happy. He lives peaceably with his neighbours, and is at peace with his own conscience. He is sure to obtain the favour and friendship of his heavenly Father. Daily and hourly he advances towards the possession of everlasting glory and perfect happiness.

J. C.

Conversion of the Jews.

Sir,

I have long ago wished to address a few lines to you in relation to the Jews, and on perusing this day some papers printed by the Society established in London for promoting the conversion of that people to Christianity, I have been induced to put that wish in execution. The motives of that society appear to me to be laudable, and, I doubt not, will be ultimately attended with some good effect, though I can by no means approve of all their measures, or of some of the sentiments they entertain, which seem to me not well calculated to answer the good purpose they have in view, that of bringing the ancient people of God to believe in him whom they once pierced. However, upon the whole, I cannot help wishing them success and encouragement. The conversion of these once favoured people to the religion of the greatest and best of their prophets, will, I doubt not, be a great blessing to all other nations. What people so fit to be the missionaries of the Redeemer to all others upon earth, some of whom, if I mistake not, in some measure, understand every language under the sun? Who so fit as the Jews to be priests unto the God of Abraham?

But some Unitarians, amongst whom I may name the justly venerated Priestley, have led me to suppose, that, of all the schemes prevalent among Christians, the Unitarian is the least objectionable to the Jews. Whether this be the case, I have not been able to learn from converse with these people, except one, who, I am persuaded, thought it much more rational and more consistent with their scriptures than the Trinitarian. He was not a priest indeed, but an ingenious artist, of good sense and conduct.

But as some Jews have been converted to Christianity, I wish to know whether any of them are proper Unitarians? I conceive the question not an improper one, and that some of your correspondents may be able satisfactorily to answer it. If all that have been converted within a century be Trinitarians, and I think some of them are, I should be glad to know the reason, if any can be given. If none be given, I should almost suspect that we err in supposing the Unitarian doctrine the most acceptable to a Jew. Do the Jews themselves generally declare the doctrine of the Trinity to be inconsistent with their scriptures? Or do they disregard all the doctrines supposed to be contained in the gospels, from prejudices of education, or for want of evidence, sufficiently convincing to their minds, of the divine mission of Jesus. The subject is, I think, worthy of discussion by some of your able correspondents, who may be more conversant with this peculiar people, their opinions and writings than I ever expect to be. Praying for the salvation of Israel, as a blessing to all the human race, the accomplishment of the divine promises, I am Sir,

Your's sincerely

J. I.

On Mr. Wright's Letter on Free Communion.

Kendal, May 18, 1813.

In your Repository (p. 252) I perceive a letter from Mr. Wright, in answer to Mr. Strephon's request. The sentiment of Mr. Wright appears to be, that if any members of a Christian church do verily deny the divine mission, miracles and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, the other members of that church have no right whatever to exclude them on that account from Christian communion. To me this does not seem to be scriptural. I shall, therefore, take notice of some of Mr. Wright's arguments, and briefly state what I consider the scriptures to teach on this subject, for the consideration of Mr. Wright, and our mutual readers.

One half of Mr. Wright's letter does not immediately bear on Mr. Strephon's question, but when he supposes the case to be real, he then comes to the point, and asks, —"Have we a right to withdraw from the Lord's table because they are there?"—To this he answers —"if we believe it our duty to attend the Lord's table, we ought not to neglect it merely because some may attend there hypocritically; if we esteem it a privilege, should we neglect it because some may abuse it?" I would wish Mr. Wright to compare his reasoning here with the testimony of the apostle Paul:—2 Cor. vi. 14—16. "Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrigteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? *or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?* and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God: as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. *Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord.*"

Mr. Wright asks another question, "Ought we to expel them, if it be in our power? To this he answers, "We can have no right, authoritatively to exclude *any* from the Lord's table, for this clear reason, because *it is the Lord's.* Jesus is the only master, and has not delegated his authority to us." To prove these assertions Mr. Wright refers us to the parable of the tares; and considers such characters "as *tares* among the *wheat,*" and then observes, "but we know who hath said, let both grow together, till the harvest." Are Mr. Wright's reasoning and conclusions justified by this parable? I think not. Our Lord has told us that the field is the *world*, not the church. (Math. xiii. 38.) The view of this parable, given by Mr. Wright, would prove too much, viz. that we ought not to put away any wicked person from a church of Christ. Mr. Wright, perhaps, was not aware of this; however, if this parable was designed to teach the propriety of a mixed communion of unbelievers with believers, this consequence cannot be avoided. And who does not see that this is plainly contradicted by Christ and his apostles. Math. xviii. 15—18. Read the whole 5th chap. of the 1 Cor. which concludes with this plain command,—"put away from among you that wicked person." To understand the parable of the tares, it is necessary that we should consider, that in the kingdom of Israel the sword was to be used against idolaters, &c. (read Deut. xiii. 6—17) but now this is at an end. In the kingdom of Christ, God has given to none the power of punishing men for idolatry, unbelief, or false religion; and the design of this parable is to teach the disciples, that he permits of no persecution for religion, and to shew them the reason of his sparing wicked men in the world.

Mr. Wright admits that "it can be no breach of Christian charity, to declare that we do not acknowledge such to be Christian brethren." But are we not acknowledging them to be Christian brethren, if we permit them to remain in a church of Christ? And if we bear this testimony concerning them, and still continue to observe the ordinances of Christ with them, are we not very inconsistent?—Would it not be acting a wiser part, if, in obedience to the command of Christ, we faithfully told them of the error they were fallen into; and if we could not succeed in convincing them, then take one or two more with us; but if after this they remained impenitent, then tell it to the whole church; and if they refused to hear the church, then let them be disowned as Christian brethren; let them be regarded as heathens, as no longer the subjects of Christ, "for what part hath he that believeth with an unbeliever?" These are my views on this subject. It will be perceived they are very different from Mr. Wright's; I shall leave it for your readers to judge on which side the truth appears.

Your's, respectfully,
WILLIAM JENNINGS.

Happy Puritan Quotation.

July 29, 1813.

Oldmixon, in his History of the Stuarts, (Fol. p. 21.) gives the following anecdote of a Puritan preaching before James the First, in 1604.

"Mr. Burgess, in his sermon, compared *ceremonies* to the Roman senator's glasses, not worth a man's life or livelihood. For, says he, "this senator invited *Augustus Cæsar* to a dinner, who, as he was coming to the feast, heard a horrid outcry, and saw a company drawing a man after them, who made the noise. The emperor demanded the cause of that violence, and was answered—their master had condemned a man to the fishponds for breaking a glass which he set a high value and esteem upon. Augustus commanded a stay of the execution, and when he came into the house, asked the senator whether he had glasses worth a man's life. Who replied, he had glasses valued at a province. 'Let me see them,' says the emperor. Accordingly he was brought into a room well furnished. The emperor allowed them to be beautiful to the eye; but, considering they might be the cause of much mischief, broke them all, saying, 'better all these perish than one man.' 'I leave,' says Mr. Burgess, 'to your Majesty to apply.' The bishops for this, and some other the like heinous crimes, got him silenced; but he was restored again to his ministry, and died in a good old age at *Sutton Colefield* in *Warwickshire*."

Calamy in his *Account* (p. 739) mentions Mr. Anthony Burgess, as ejected from the living of Sutton Colefield, in which he had succeeded Dr. *John Burgess*. This must have been the preacher before King James. The anecdote of Augustus I cannot find in Suetonius, nor am I aware from whence it was quoted. Your readers will recollect, that the Romans were accustomed to nourish their fish for the table with the carcases of their slaves. Nor was the practice confined to those convicted of crimes. It is recorded of *Cato the Censor*, that he thus disposed of his *slaves* when too old and infirm for labour. Such was heathen morality in one of its fairest forms.

SELECTOR.

Answer to "the Dissenting Minister's Complaint."

July 15, 1813.

Mr. Editor,

The age in which we live is a complaining one; and whilst men of various descriptions are giving vent to their discontents, it is nothing surprising that the dissenting minister should do so too. At the same time, what was held out to the public on this subject in your last Number, (p. 366,) ought to have been strictly conformable to truth: "nothing extenuated, nor aught set down in malice." Querulous and uncandid representations have a bad effect, not only upon the minds of such youth as have turned their thoughts towards the ministry, but also on the whole body of dissenting laity. Angry sneers at "rolling carriages," "quilted pews," and "daughters fashionably educated," are not the best means for bettering the worldly condition of a class of men for which it is easier to wish a better provision, than to procure it. I am one of those Sir, who have, during a tolerably long life endeavoured both by example and exhortation to promote so desirable a state of things; and I must say, for the honour of the Society of which I am a member, that, when properly called upon, it has never on any occasion, shrunk back from the duty of affording pecuniary assistance to its ministers or to their families: of this I could bring many striking instances. Your complaining correspondent, is well descended; his venerable ancestor, he says, "evinced the power of truth, and the low value at which worldly honours and profits are held by those who seek a kingdom which cannot be moved."—His views were glorious, and the sacrifice was noble; worthy of being imitated by his descendant; who, if he be not imbued with some portion of this spirit, has mistaken his course of life. But I fear he has entered his profession with the same view of making a fortune in it, as the physician or the advocate, (whose gains he seems to envy) are wont to do; although uniform experience ought to have taught him, "that worldly honours and profits are not the reward of those who preach the kingdom of God."—In his sacred profession, men do not, nor ought they to enter the list with those who strive in the race where worldly riches is the prize. I most readily grant that a worthy and laborious Dissenting minister is deserving a larger stipend than he generally receives; yet I cannot admit it to be true that "our respectable congregations think they do enough for their minister if they raise a little more than 100l. per ann.;" and that stipends have lowered, is so far from being the fact (except in very declining congregations) that in most places, I believe, they have been raised. The description which this gentleman gives of his own situation, certainly calls for commiseration; but let him look at those from whom his salary, whatever it may be, is collected; are not many of them so bowed down with the expences of the days in which we live, and with the loss of trade, as scarcely to be able to spare from the wants of their own families, that portion which they give to their minister? and has he not witnessed the ruin and bankruptcy of others whom he once looked upon as his opulent friends? Your correspondent bids us "consider the actual price of the necessaries of life;" a proper consideration no doubt; but let *him* also reflect that these necessaries are not dear to him, and cheap to his flock. The discontented mind of this divine, has, I am sorry to say it, given an angry, sarcastic, and uncandid turn to his animadversions; why else should he represent congregations as "*being desirous* of keeping their minister in honourable poverty?" or why should he retail the pretended "illiberal and base insinuations" of those who are said to have declared "that they pay enough,"—and that "their ministers are as well off as others of the community?" or disgust us with anecdotes of individual meanness?—This gentleman has thought proper, on the other hand, to suppress the whole of what might reflect any honour upon the body of dissenting laity, or tend to rescue it from the charge of meanness or illiberality: nothing is said of those calls which are constantly made upon the wealthy for the support of institutions established by them for the education of youth; nor of such as contemplate giving assistance to declining age, or to the orphan families of Dissenting ministers; nor of those casual subscriptions which are frequently occurring, for some object connected with the relief or comfort of those who minister in spiritual things. By way of justifying his complaints and heightening them by the contrast, this gentleman bids us "look at the Church."—We do so; and what do we see in the church? More complaints and more real poverty and distress, amidst all its wealth, than this dissatisfied divine seems to have any idea of. In the debate of last week, on the Curate's Bill, Mr. Rose asserted that there were a thousand Curacies of less than £50, and 1642 of less than £80 per annum: besides 2104 incumbents at less than £100. This is not stated by me to shew that our ministers "are very well off," but to prove the absurdity of this way of reasoning: besides, the dissenting is not so sterile a soil as some may imagine; we have rich physicians, bankers, advocates and merchants, and these are among the sons of the prophets. One cause of this gentleman's complaint, is that in order to support a family he is under the necessity of labouring in some auxiliary way; what his labours might have been had he been thrown into some other walk of life, I cannot say; but this I will take upon me to affirm without fear of denial, that no set of men brought up to the common occupations or professions, can, or do give up so much time to relaxation and pleasure as our young divines are in the habit of doing. The gospel is certainly "a pearl of great price," but its value does not depend, as this gentleman seems to think it does, upon the money we pay for it; though I am far from denying that those who *serve* at the altar ought to *live* by it. With respect to the decline of that good old custom of sending tokens of regard for our ministers in the shape of viands, I could point out a way of accounting for that, which would rescue the laity from the charge of meanness, but I chuse to be silent on this head; wishing to say nothing that might offend; at the same time that justice demanded that some notice should be taken of the misrepresentations of a discontented man who has thought fit to make his own case, the case of every Dissenting minister.

VERAX.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

Primitivus in Answer to Mr. Jones. (*See pp.* 392—466—521.)

Sir,

Allow me now to resume my observations on Mr. Jones's letter on Acts xx. 28.

The support given by the Æthiopic version to the received text, *του θεου*, remains without any confirmation from Mr. Jones. This is evident from his relying on the *Latin translation* of that V. in Walton's Polyglott, which I will immediately shew to be undeserving of that reliance. First, because, in the opinion of Michaelis, a good judge, as I will take for granted, and your readers will allow, that Latin translation has little merit. My small study furnishes me with but few books, which obliges me to make the best use I can of those which I possess. The work of Michaelis, which pronounces on the merit of the translation in question, is not among my small number; but the report of Dr. Middleton, who could have no motive to sacrifice his reputation, by a false account, is of sufficient authority to prove the Professor's opinion. The passage to which I particularly refer is in p. 460 of "Greek Article," which, however, is not the only one that would serve my purpose.

His words are, "Mr. Wakefield every where professes his high opinion of this version, (the Æthiopic) but I do not recollect that he has any where informed us on what ground his esteem is founded; whether on the merits of the version itself, of which, according to Michaelis, we know less than of any other Oriental Version: but which, as far as respects the Epistles, he says, was made by a person who was very inadequate to the task; or merely on the Latin, which, according to the same critic, is of little value." I rely on this account as a faithful report of Michaelis's opinion, which will be deemed sufficient to establish my position, at least in default of better evidence, that the Latin translation of the Æ. V. has little merit. If Dr. Middleton has misled his readers, he must answer for himself.

But, secondly, the Latin translation, whatever may be its general value, is of no weight as to the text from which the Æ. V. was made, because, if the word be one which stands, in that V. for θεος and for κυριος indiscriminately, as asserted by Griesbach, it would naturally be rendered into Latin by *Deus* or *Dominus* indifferently, according to the determination of the translator. Griesbach's assertion, therefore, is not at all impugned by Mr. Jones's Latin from the Polyglott, nor is Mr. Wakefield's *gentle* censure of him in the least confirmed. Indeed, whatever the term in the Æ. V. may be, the translator may be supposed to have had his innocent prejudices, so, at least, as to translate an *ambiguous* word favourably, if possible, to his own creed, if he might not also have thought it justifiable even to render a *plain* one, that should militate against that creed, by one more favourable to it, especially if that should have the support, as in this case, of the common Greek and of the Vulgate Version. Mr. W. and G. therefore, stand as they did, for any thing that Mr. Jones has asserted, for his proof entirely fails. For my own part, I freely own myself disposed to believe Griesbach; as I have no proof of Mr. W's. superiority over him on this point, and think it far more candid, however Mr. J. may question my "candor," to suppose that Mr. W's. *passion*, which is apparent from his language, led him into error, though I still suspect his *knowledge*, than to admit that G. has asserted a deliberate or infamous falsehood, as he is accused of doing by Mr. W. and his defender. However, I really wish that the point, though of small importance indeed to Acts xx. 28, were finally decided by some oriental scholar of established authority, which has not been done, as far as I know, although orthodoxy would scarcely have slumbered if the assertion of Mr. W. had been capable of proof. I fear that it has been all the while indulging a laugh in the sleeve at the aid lent to it by granting it the reading του θεου, while it turned up its nose, in scorn, at the attempt to enfeeble that aid by the curious rendering of, *his own son*.

Mr. J. joins the Arabic version with the Æthiopic as bearing the same testimony. But, on enquiry, he will find this to be a mistake, for the reading which that V. would countenance is του κυριου θεου, an expression not to be found in any Greek writer.

Before the conclusion of his second paragraph, which is the first of his attack on Griesbach, Mr. J. has granted to that critic all that he could wish, and totally given up the defence of Mr. W. He says, "the Æthiopic translator associated with *ϑεος* the same awful or even superstitious idea which the Septuagint had done with the term Jehovah; (is this perfectly correct as to the LXX?) he therefore seems to render *θεος* by (a word equivalent to) *κυριος* wherever it occurs, and by that word when used absolutely or unrestricted he ever means the Supreme Being." Was this the case, in sooth? I have no business with what *he meant* by (the word equivalent to) *κυριος*, here, or in as many places as Mr. J. chooses. What has Griesbach said more, who had to settle his text, let the meaning be what it might? Is it, then, granted that the translator's rendering is the same as would do for the Greek word *κυριος*? Whence is it then concluded that his text, whether Greek or not Greek is not yet determined, contained the reading *θεος*? This *supposition* of Mr. J., for he will scarcely contend that it is any thing more, does his cause no service, and he might well have spared his inference, that "Mr. W. knew this, and he asserts it," (he asserts, by the by, no such thing) "though the assertion, it must be allowed, is weakened by the appeal which he makes to his own recollection." Had Mr. Wakefield thus thought or asserted, he never would have so harshly charged infamous falsehood on Griesbach, whose position is thus undesignedly established, though with qualifications, which, however, answer no purpose; for "absolutely" and "unrestricted" are mere sounding words employed to serve an occasion, and the reading of the Æ. V. is not altered by them.

Mr. J. next argues that as *ἡ εκκλησια του κυριου* is no where used in the N. T. therefore it cannot be the reading of this text. This is some presumption, I allow, against it, but the inference is not irrefragable. If the reading be established by good proof, its being *ἁπαξ λεγομενον* would not exclude it. Although *η δοξα θεου* and *η δοξα του θεου* are often to be found in the N. T., *η δοξα κυριου* is read *but once*, and in that instance there are various readings; yet without disturbing the expression. However this may be, the next sentence falls harmless out of the writer's hands, and must be attributed to an oversight little to be expected from Mr. Jones's sagacity. It is, in substance, that, if the reading *του κυριου* were admitted, it would not mean Christ but God; "because *ο κυριος*, when used in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, unrestricted by some other word or circumstances in the context, ever denotes the Supreme Being." On this I observe, first, that it would seem hence that Mr. J. thinks *ὁ κυριος* to be an appellation of the Supreme Being frequently occurring, and one peculiarly appropriated to God and exclusive generally of all others. Than this nothing can be less founded. Michaelis seems to have doubted whether God, or the Father, is ever in the N. T. called *ὁ κυριος*, and Dr. Middleton corrects him by a scanty collection of texts.

Had Mr. J's observation been predicated of *κυριος* instead of *ὁ κυριος*, it would have been generally and fundamentally true. The state of the case is nearly this, though I know that I am treading on tender ground, of which Mr. J. was not aware when he wrote as above: God, both in the Seventy and in the N. T. is generally styled *κυριος* when no other word is added, and not very often *ὁ κυριος*. In the Seventy *κυριος* is *appropriated* to God, and used of no other absolutely. The same may be said of the N. T. generally, the absence of the article, in other applications of it, being easily accounted for, on good principles. This being the case, it was of importance to Bishop Pearson, towards proving the divinity of Christ, to shew that he also is called *κυριος*, very unlike Mr. Jones who seems to think that *ο κυριος* is more sacredly applied to the Almighty. The Bishop has produced about a hundred passages to make good his point, not one of which will serve his purpose. The most plausible is *ημερα κυριου*, which may not mean particularly the *day of Christ*. Dr. Middleton, pp. 294, 295, has attempted to furnish more decided examples, without success. But, secondly, as to the application of *ὁ κυριος*, or *κυριος*, to none but the Supreme Being without some word or circumstance to restrain them, no one can hesitate to allow the position. The observation, however, does not help out Mr. J's. conclusion, that Griesbach has, by adopting *του κυριου* in his text, "introduced a change of words, without any change whatever in the meaning, which shews him, either unacquainted with Greek, or destitute of judgment." For, if we adopt *του κυριου*, have we not the very condition which he requires, "words or circumstances in the context," which as effectually restrict the expression to Christ as any passage in the whole N. T.? The disciples said to the two that had been at Emmaus, *The Lord*, *ὁ κυριος*, *hath risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simeon?* The words *hath risen* and *appeared* point out Jesus as the person intended. But are not the words in the text under consideration, viz. *which he hath purchased with his own blood*, as strongly restrictive? For I pronounce it as impossible for the Supreme Being to have *shed his blood*, as it was for him, after shedding his blood, to have *risen* and *appeared*. Although Mr. J. deserves to be reprehended for his insinuation that Griesbach was, for adopting *του κυριου*, "either unacquainted," &c. I will not retort. It is enough to shew that G's. Greek and his judgment stand unjustly impeached, because the attack upon him is altogether founded in error.

On the whole, I see no reason to doubt the ground by which Griesbach's reading is supported. Mr. J. however, although he appears unsuccessful, in his defence of Mr. Wakefield and in his attack on Griesbach, which is the proper design of his paper, must be allowed the praise of ingenuity and originality, in the interpretation of the latter part of the verse, if the reading *του θεου* should prove to be genuine, which I confess is far from appearing to me to be the case. Mr. J. is the friend to whom I referred, at the conclusion of the paper signed Primitivus. But as I then did not rightly apprehend his solution, the whole of that passage should be cancelled. Having mentioned this, I beg leave to observe, that in that paper several other errors appear, which may be attributed to my haste and bad writing. Grammatical faults need not to be noticed, as your readers will probably impute them to the true cause. The parenthesis, however, respecting *these* languages, is so totally wrong, that it should be erased. Other blemishes must remain. But to conclude.

An objection or two seem to militate against Mr. J.'s novel and ingenious interpretation of the latter part of our text, where he supposes that the person who purchased the church of God is not God, but *he*, that is, Jesus Christ, *he* emphatically. First, I doubt whether emphasis can be inferred, where no nominative case is employed, except where there is no other resource. Prophetic language is reserved, so that the reference to the LXX, Micah vi. 2, seems insufficient. The saying of the disciples of Pythagoras, αυτος εφα, referring to himself without further description, has the nominative expressed, which is the thing I want, and confirms my objection. 2dly. The rule, "a clause introduced to define the object, cannot be separated from it and changed, to become the agent of the same verb," is worded obscurely, and the drift of it seems to be contradicted by other passages, unless the cautious fence drawn round it renders it secure. Fearing to appear prompt to object to every thing, and wanting leisure and inclination for the search, I have not looked designedly for phrases which may contravene this canon. But I would offer the following passages out of the LXX to Mr. J.'s attention, to which others might be added. Josh. xxiv. 31, παντα τα εργα κυριου οςα εποιησε. 1 Kings xv. 29, το ρημα κυριου ο ελαλησε. 2 Kings xviii. 16, τας εντολας αυτου οσας ενετειλατο. Jerem. xxxvi. 4, παντας τους λογους κυριου ους ελαλησε. 3dly. The novelty of Mr. J.'s interpretation seems to be a strong argument against it. How came it, if, as he seems to say, the ancients were embarrassed respecting *the blood of God*, and therefore substituted κυριου for θεου, that *they*, who knew Greek usage in no mean degree, never stumbled on this solution, which would have served them quite as well as corrupting the text? I fear they did not apprehend that the passage would admit it. In so long a lapse of ages, one would have expected that this canon of criticism, or, at least, that ingenuity and embarrassment, would have come to their relief, if there had been room for them. Surely, however, their bias was strongly, not against, but for, του θεου; and I can account, on no other supposition, for the reading, του κυριου και θεου, found in so many manuscripts, which decidedly is not the true reading, as the manuscripts are of little value which Mr. J. has not noticed. Had θεου been already in the text, what need was there of κυριου before it, which clearly increases the supposed difficulty, as the words so united are more decidedly the appellation of the Supreme Being. On the contrary, orthodox zeal would naturally add θεου to κυριου, as this would unequivocally prove the divinity of Christ to persons knowing nothing of Mr. J.'s rule and interpretation. The first degree of daring would naturally be a small *addition*, not speedily to be detected. The next would be the rejection of the original reading, του κυριου, entirely, that the possible reference of *his own blood*, to that expression might be precluded, and that its necessary application to του θεου, now standing alone, might triumphantly establish the divinity of Christ, of whom, exclusively, *shedding his own blood* could, it was with good reason thought, be predicated. Lastly, I dare not yet trust to this new interpretation, as a secure defence against the *impiety* which Mr. Wakefield so justly dreaded. Give the learned or the unlearned the reading του ϑεου, *of God*, and they will not scruple to shed his blood, if by that means they can establish the divinity of Christ. Canons and rules will prove a weak barrier against the inundation of mystery and blasphemy that will ensue.

The truth, however, is the truth. If the new interpretation can be confirmed, I shall have no unwillingness to read, the church *of God*, if that reading can be established also. But no consideration can induce me to believe, that God, whether a first or second person is of little consequence, *shed his blood*, or that this text teaches that God purchased a church by *his own Son*. I like Mr. Jones's conjecture as a *dernier resort*. At present, it seems unnecessary and not founded. Griesbach's reading yet maintains its ground, and answers every purpose of defence against impiety. The appearance of a faithful translation of his note in your Repository would be highly acceptable and extensively useful.

Your readers will pardon this obtrusion on their attention, though at such great length. They will, however, be glad to be now released, as I am in bearing my humble testimony to your excellent and liberal publication, into which alone any thing like free discussion of religious subjects, any thing in the shape of theologigal and biblical criticism, is admitted in this enlightened country and extensive empire. Go on and prosper.

CHARLES LLOYD.

REVIEW.

"Still pleas'd to praise, yet not afraid to blame.—**Pope.**

Art. I. *Essays on the Language of Scripture; with Additions and Corrections.** *In Two Volumes. By John Simpson.*† Printed by Cruttwell, Bath. Sold in London; by Egerton and by

---

* All or most of these Essays were at first printed, successively and separately, for circulation among the author's friends.

† In the interval between the transmission and the appearance of this article, the excellent writer of the *Essays*, &c. which are the subject of it, has finished his mortal course. We knew, admired and esteemed, and shall long lament him. It was our hope, we confess, that our notice of this his last valuable publication, might meet his eye, and, on the whole, obtain his approbation. We were persuaded that he would

Johnson and Co. 1812. 8vo. Vol. I. pp. 496, Vol. II. pp. 380.

There are two methods of reading and interpreting scripture,—the popular and the critical; or, as we may describe them, in rather different language, the superficial and the deliberative. The meaning of the sacred writings is commonly judged of by their sound, and by certain early associations of ideas, the correctness of which it is deemed criminal for the possessor of them to doubt or even to investigate. On the other hand, reflecting men compare words with words, phrases with phrases, passages with passages: they pay diligent attention to the circumstances of the authors, to the usages of the countries in which they lived, to their known characters, to their professed design; and, by the aid of this process, the volume of revelation explains itself, for the most part, naturally, easily and consistently. The difference between these modes of expounding the scriptures, is much the same with what obtains between a vulgar and a just philosophy in physics. Ignorant and careless observers, men who cannot or will not exercise patient thought, pronounce concerning the solar system from impressions made upon their senses. They reason, (if indeed they can with any propriety be said to *reason*,) from present and *mere* appearances. Seeing the sun rise every day in the east and set as regularly in the west, they conclude that it performs a diurnal revolution in the heavens: and, in like manner, they imagine that the moon, the planets and the stars serve no other purposes than those of adorning the firmament and relieving, in some measure, the darkness of the night. To gain even tolerably correct conceptions of the grandeur and simplicity of that portion of creation to which our earth belongs, and still more of the universe, requires the improvement of our time and an effort of the mind. With this view, the prejudices of the infant and the child, the tales of the nursery, if not of the parlour, must be forgotten and dismissed: one phenomenon must be surveyed in relation to another, and the illusions of sense be rectified by the dictates of the judgment. No man, who ventures to account for the appearances of nature without the help of science, has the slightest pretensions to the name of a philosopher: nor is any one worthy of being listened to in the character of an expositor of the Bible, whether from the pulpit or the press, who interprets it on principles contradictory to those which we have been stating. Since the days of Locke, (and perhaps we cannot find a merely human writer

---

not be offended, if we sometimes dissented from his reasonings and conclusions: we trusted that at least he would not condemn the spirit of our remarks: and we looked forward to the possibility, if not the probability, of being favoured, in the pages of the Monthly Repository, with communications on a few points of scriptural criticism from this amiable, candid and learned person. Our expectations are awfully disappointed. We mourn, in common with numbers, the loss of a bright ornament of the Christian cause. But we have not judged it necessary or expedient to suppress this part of our Review, which perhaps will attract attention in consequence of the peculiar and very painful circumstances under which it is submitted to our readers.

REV.

to whom the cause of intellectual, political and religious truth is more substantially indebted,) an opinion has gained ground among critics and divines, that scripture is the best and only legitimate expounder of scripture. Though the number of those who receive and illustrate this sentiment is extremely small, when contrasted with the multitude of persons who never think about it or by whom it is practically denied, yet we do not recollect that the proposition itself has been called in question: and even were it opposed, as we know that it is disregarded, the opposition would not be more respectable, or ultimately more successful, than what has been given to the philosophy of Newton; it would not be more deserving the notice of real scholars. The single distinction, and assuredly a very important one, between the cases, is this: errors as to the philosophy of the universe are far less injurious than the application of false criticism to the scriptures. From the works of Voltaire, Gibbon and some other unbelievers, we learn that infidelity does not scruple to avail itself of current and mistaken interpretations of passages in the Bible, in order to arraign with more plausibility the evidences of revelation. Not less notorious is it, that men have attempted to support Anti-christian doctrines by the habit of detaching texts from whatever precedes and follows, and then citing them as irrefragable proofs of some favourite tenet. Our Saviour's words, Matt. iv. 7, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God," have been gravely urged as a demonstration of his own essential deity; and the same article of faith has been erected on 1 John v. 20, "We are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." Upon points of conduct, too, unwarrantable principles of sacred criticism have exercised an influence. Sometimes a highly figurative, sometimes a rigorously literal, exposition of the scriptures, has given birth to practices which, it is generally agreed, no fair explanation of these writings can sustain, and even to acts which the precepts and the spirit of them are understood by most persons to condemn.

Such being the evils that flow from the wrong criticism of scripture, and such, by consequence, the value of solid principles of interpretation in reference to this volume, we must acknowledge the obligations which, in common with all consistent friends of the Bible, we owe to the author of these *Essays, &c.* for his very meritorious labours. Few men are better qualified for such researches. Having, in early life, enjoyed signal advantages, which he well improved, for appreciating the moment and drawing from the sources of scriptural criticism,* he has happily possessed sufficient leisure for prosecuting his inquiries into the records of revelation, together with a fortune and a spirit which have both prompted and enabled him to lay the result of those inquiries before the public in the most disinterested manner. An excellent little tract, which he printed a few years since, on *the Impropriety of the usual Method of teaching Theology*, and in which he admirably shews that Protestants should take their views of divine doctrines immediately from the Bible, might not improperly have been prefixed to the present work. Nor is this tract the only specimen of Mr. Simpson's eminent fitness for the employment in which we now find him engaged. His Essay to evince that Christianity is best conveyed in the historical form, and his treatises on the excellence and internal evidences of this religion, testify that he is a theologian of no ordinary distinction, that, while he is largely acquainted with books, he is indebted, still more, to his own patient, reflecting, candid, impartial mind, that he is diligent in the investigation, intrepid, yet unobtrusive, in the avowal of what he conceives to be the will of God, that he is an accurate thinker and reasoner, a perspicuous and often an elegant writer.

---

* Mon. Repos. Vol. viii. 166, 229.

These volumes are the fruits of time, of care and deliberation. Our account of them will be as concise as justice to the author and our readers may admit: where we are particularly gratified by his skill and judgment, and where we see cause of differing from him, we shall stop either to express our approbation or to state the reasons of our dissent; and, at the conclusion of the article, we shall subjoin a few remarks on the classification of texts in general, and on the mode of classing them adopted by Mr. Simpson.

A short preface announces the design of the Essays, declares that increased "veneration for and attachment to the Bible" which the writer feels, as effects of these inquiries, and brings forward some respectable opinions and authorities in favour of a thorough and unbiassed search into the true meaning of scripture, together with passages in the New Testament itself that are decisive to this purpose.

The first Essay is on the duration of a future state of punishments and rewards. By way of introduction to it, the author lays down rules of interpretation, the justness of which we are neither able nor disposed to controvert: to none of them, we presume, can a sound scriptural critic, be he of what communion he may, reasonably demur.

This Essay has two general divisions: in the former, those expressions are considered which relate to the duration of the future punishment of the wicked; in the latter, those which relate to the duration of the future happiness of the righteous. Agreeably to the arrangement thus made, Mr. Simpson begins with producing ten texts, (Heb. vi. 2. should perhaps be added,) which he believes to be all the instances wherein the words *αιων* and *αιωνιος* are applied in the New Testament to the duration of future punishment: and, in order to ascertain the exact meaning of these words, he previously inquires how they are used respecting other subjects in the New Testament and in the LXX translation of the Old.

Eighteen examples are, accordingly, given of the application of *αιων* to *present time*, *this life* or *age* or *world*. We shall pause for a moment, to observe that, on an examination of this set of texts, we find them strictly pertinent to the purpose for which they are adduced, and that 1 Cor. viii. 13. "I will not eat flesh" *εις τον αιωνα*, "*for ever*," or *during my whole life*, seems a most unequivocal proof of *αιων* being sometimes employed simply in regard to the present stage of man's existence. Our translators have here thought proper to refrain from a perfectly literal rendering,* and, by not following their usual course, have prevented most of their readers from seeing that the phrase *for ever* does not always import *infinite duration.* Wakefield and Newcome, on the contrary, have been faithful to the original.

In ten passages of the Christian scriptures, *αιων* and *αιωνιος* stand for *past* limited duration, of different periods. We may remark that there are many such instances in the LXX. Mr. S. has further collected twenty-two from the sacred volume throughout, in which these words are applied to *future* limited duration. He rightly interprets Heb. vi. 5. of the Christian system.

Our author finds that in eleven texts, taken exclusively from the New Testament, these same expressions signify duration *without end.* However, in this series of passages, most of those where *αιων* occurs have a repetition of the word, v. g. *τȣς αιωνας των αιωνων.* In seven places, the terms bear the meaning of duration *without beginning and without end.*

We fully subscribe to the following deduction of Mr. Simpson's, (p. 17.)

> "It appears from the different senses of the adjective *αιωνιος*, and from the much more frequent application of *αιων* the substantive, to denote a limited, than an eternal duration, that no conclusion can be fairly drawn *merely* from the use of these words for the absolute eternity either of the punishment of the wicked or of the happiness of the righteous."

In page 18 he has introduced a consideration which, however valid in itself, may by some persons be deemed foreign to an Essay on the language of *Scripture*, &c. There are those who, if they do not deny that the doctrine of the strict eternity of future punishments, "militates against all *their* ideas of the infinite mercy and goodness of God," will yet remind Mr. S. that the present inquiry is, whether this tenet be inculcated in the sacred writings ?

The next section is devoted to an examination of the scriptural sense of the words *απολλυμι* and *απωλεια.*

To *kill*, or *destroy temporally*, and to *die*, is stated to be the most frequent meaning of *απολλυμι* in the New Testament. About thirty-six examples of this signification of it are brought together by our author; eight, where it is put for to *lose life*, *this life*, *the life after this ;* eleven, where it stands for *losing any thing ;* and eight, where it expresses *going astray.* But the last sense is obviously the same with that of being *lost for a time.*

This verb has also various other meanings, such as to *punish*, to *make foolish* or *impotent*, to *induce to offend or act contrary to conscience*, *&c.* Nine cases are adduced of its application to the future life.

For the present, at least, we shall do no more than quote Mr. Simpson's declaration in respect of the opinion that future punishment will consist in annihilation : he says, p. 29,

---

* They have committed the same offence against correctness in 1 Sam. iii. 35. "He shall walk before mine anointed *for ever* :" literally and better, *all his days.*

"In the New Testament, I believe, no instance occurs, in which *απολλυμι* or [*and*] *απωλεια* necessarily require to be understood of eternal death or annihilation, when they are applied to the future punishment of the wicked."

Απωλεια, in the twenty passages where we meet with it, has four leading significations: in seven places, it means *death* or *temporal destruction*; in two, *waste, profusion;* in four, *injury, hurt, calamity;* and in the rest it is applied to *the future life.*

Ολεθρος is found in only four passages of the Christian Scriptures. In 1 Cor. v. 5.* it denotes some kind of *mortification* or *pain*, in 1 Tim. vi. 9, *punishment, present or future, or both*, in 1 Thess. v. 3, *impending calamity*, in 2 Thess. i. 9, *the highest degree of future punishment, in whatever it consist.*

Those texts in the New Testament of which the word *πυρ* makes part, are next placed before our eyes. To the enumeration of them many good observations of the writer's are annexed. He appears to coincide so far with the advocates of what has been styled *the annihilation scheme* as to understand the metaphors in these passages not only of grievous suffering, but, moreover, of destruction by death; "the wicked," he adds, "are described as dying again after severe punishment, in the world to come." 46.

The origin and meaning of the term *γεεννα* are distinctly pointed out by this author: it seems more expressive of the severity than of the duration of future punishments; at any rate, it does not represent their absolute eternity. From an induction of passages Mr. S. concludes, likewise, that the word *Αδης* "has no relation to vice or virtue, reward or punishment, but signifies merely the state of the dead in general." 51.

He next investigates the sense of the words *αποθνησκω, θανατος, δευτερος θανατος.* It is his judgment that "death does not convey the idea of an eternal suspension [loss] of life, or of total extinction of being." The second death, he tells us, "consists in Death himself and hades, or the state of the dead, and all who are not written in the book of life, being cast into the lake of fire; which is figuratively saying that they shall be *abolished*, or that there shall be an end put to death, to the state of the dead, and to there being any who are not written in the book of life" (53). But how does this view of the matter accord with Rev. ii. 11.?—with the assurance, "He that overcometh, shall not be hurt of the second death!" In Mr. S's. opinion, the second death is an event most animating and glorious: agreeably to the Saviour's promise, recorded in the Apocalypse, it is a catastrophe singularly injurious and afflictive! We think that in Rev. xx. 14* the words *the second death* are synonymous with *the lake of fire.* If the respectable author of these Essays, will turn to the passage in Griesbach's last edition, he will perceive that some words are added† to the verse, which give the whole clause the appearance of being a gloss; an inference the more probable, as the text of this book is still very far from having been restored to purity.

---

* Mon. Rep. Vol. V. 555.

* Let this text be compared with Rev. xx. 6. and 1 Thess. iv. 16.

† The addition, undoubtedly, is suspicious: yet its existence serves to shew the light in which the phrase *the second death* was viewed.

Φϑειρω in 1 Cor. iii. 17, seems to describe punishment indefinitely, without any relation to future punishment in particular: and this remark may be extended to its derivative *φθορα*. The strict meaning of *κολάσις* is corrective punishment. It is observable that we meet with the substantive but twice in the gospels and epistles. How far a word of such infrequent occurrence, will warrant the conclusion sometimes deduced from it, may admit of doubt.

The eleventh section contains arguments to shew that future punishment will reform the wicked, and fit them for pure and spiritual happiness. Of these arguments some are scriptural: but some are derived from other sources—from analogies in the divine government and from the natural suggestions of the human heart. Nor do we look upon Mr. Simpson's quotations from the New Testament as being uniformly pertinent. We allow indeed that Rom. v. 15, &c. is highly deserving of regard. The stress however placed by the writer, on such phrases as I will draw *all men* unto me, reconcile *all things* to himself, the Saviour of *all men*, the sins of *the whole world*, &c. is perhaps excessive. These and similar passages we expound not of all men *literally* and *individually*, but of the universality of the Christian dispensation, of the equal communication of its blessings to *the two great divisions of mankind*, of the union of believing Jews and believing Gentiles in the church of Christ.

The following observations are forcible and important, (p. 67):

> "Had Jesus or his apostles designed to have represented the duration of future punishment by terms that signified extinction of being after a certain period of misery, or never ceasing torment, they might easily have done either of these. *Τιμωρια* is used for the greatest punishment; Heb. x. 29: and *αιδιος*, for proper eternity; Rom. i. 20; Wisdom vii. 26. By these words, which are stronger than any that are applied to future punishment in the New Testament, Josephus has expressed the idea which the Pharisees entertained of the never ceasing torments of the wicked. De Bello Judaico, lib. ii. cap. viii. sec. 14, p. 1065, ed. Hudson."

In pp. 68, 69, our author, from his foregoing enumeration of texts, forms inferences decidedly in favour of the doctrine of final universal restoration to virtue and happiness. His twelfth section contains objections and replies. In this part of his undertaking his judgment and ability are not least conspicuous; we should gladly make some extracts from it, did not our limits constrain us to refer our readers to the work itself.

Under the second chapter, containing thirteen sections, an enumeration is made of Greek terms employed by the writers of the New Testament to describe the duration of the future happiness of the righteous. In two passages *Διηνεκες* is used of limited, in two, of unlimited, existence. Concerning this and every similar word, in its application to the present subject, one remark may be made: The life of virtuous men in the world to come, is always spoken of, by Jesus and his apostles, as *everlasting*. It is declared to be such in so many places and in so great a variety of phrase that we cannot reasonably doubt whether the expression should be taken in its absolute and literal meaning. But whenever this or any corresponding epithet is applied to a topic with which it is seldom joined, probably, it should then be understood in a more qualified sense, and interpreted agreeably to its connection and the general tenor of revelation.

We should be unjust to Mr. Simpson were we not to transcribe his two concluding paragraphs: 91, 92.

"If there be joy over *one* sinner who repenteth, (Luke xv. 7. Matt. xviii. 13.) what an inconceivable multiplication of this joy must there be, at the restoration of millions of mankind from the death of sin to a life of undefiled and unceasing enjoyment? Can any one who sympathises with the state of every human being, refrain from rejoicing at the prospect of such a wide diffusion of felicity? The more he has dreaded the extension of misery to the unspeakable numbers who leave this world unfitted for the relish of pure and virtuous pleasures, the more gladly will he contemplate that awful, grand and animating scene, when Jesus, having accomplished the extensively benevolent purposes of his divine commission, shall deliver up his kingdom and power to the Father, who then will be all in all. The perfection of his power, wisdom and goodness, in his general government of the world, and in the formation and completion, by his honoured missionaries, of the great scheme for the final everlasting salvation and happiness of his whole family on earth, will then be clearly displayed, and be gratefully acknowledged by all: And the myriads of his rational creatures that have succeeded each other since the first formation of the world, being all restored to purity and happiness, will rejoice to promote the unalloyed felicity of each other, to the widest limits of their respective powers, and to increase in resemblance to perfection itself, throughout the endless ages of eternity.

"Glorious and delightful consummation! O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and goodness of God! How inexpressibly sublime the close of such a scheme, so worthy of its kind and all-perfect Contriver, so suitable to the character of the gentle and benevolent Messenger of the great design, the Father of the Age, the Prince of Peace. Isa. ix. 5. Well might the prophet exclaim, 'Break forth into joy, exult together, for Jehovah will comfort his people, and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of God;' Isa. lii. 9, 10. Well might the Evangelist call the instructions of Jesus, the glad tidings of his kingdom: Matt. iv. 23. Well might a messenger of heaven be represented as proclaiming these everlasting glad tidings to every nation, kindred, tongue and people that dwell on the face of the earth! Rev. xiv. 6."

In reviewing so largely the first of this Series of Essays, &c. we have been influenced by two considerations,—the one, our desire of affording the readers of our Repository a specimen of the manner in which Mr. Simpson investigates the sense of scripture,—the other, the acknowledged interest of the subject. We hope to be excused for briefly stating our sentiments on the question, whether the evidence usually alleged for regarding the finite duration of future punishment as a doctrine of revelation, be legitimate and satisfactory?

There is an obvious distinction between tenets which the New Testament is *by all Christians understood to teach*, and those which men are accustomed to receive as *matters of inference* from its contents: the former are, confessedly, authorative and divine; it is possible that the latter may be nothing more than human theories and imaginations. We learn from our Lord and his apostles that there will be a resurrection of the just to happiness, of the unjust to suffering. Upon this head there can be no dispute. It is an assurance of unrivalled magnitude. Who will say that the doctrine of universal restoration* (assuming it, for a moment to be true) equals what we have now mentioned, either in the clearness of its proofs or in the importance of its application?

It has been the general propensity of believers in the gospel to seek for more in the records of their religion than those records were intended to disclose. This appears to have been the habit of the late amiable Cowper, as may be seen in a letter which he wrote on occasion of his brother's death; and we are of opinion that it is not entirely confined to the class of Christians among whom he ranked. When once a theological hypothesis has been framed, its author and its admirers feel no great difficulty in discovering that it best explains and reconciles certain passages of scripture: and, by a very natural illusion of the imagination and error of the judgment, they conceive that revelation evidently inculcates points of which perhaps the most we can with truth affirm is that they are not at variance with revelation. Hence many persons are confident of its being an article of Christianity that the future punishment of the wicked will issue in their recovery from sin and its direful effects; while some few maintain, with not less of positivity, that the language of the first preachers of the gospel, dooms to annihilation the impenitent transgressor.

We are far from censuring modest and sober inquiry on these topics. But we protest against either the one or the other of the above conclusions being pressed upon us as an essential part of a Christian's creed; we protest against the belief of either being connected, in the minds of our readers, with the adoption or the rejection of certain opinions as to the object of worship and the terms of acceptance. To a reflecting person reasons will easily occur why Infinite Wisdom might see proper not to reveal more on this point than the simple fact that "God will render unto every man according to his works;" and our reception, severally, of the tenet of universal restoration, and of that of final annihilation, will not exactly indicate what are our sentiments concerning the nature of Jesus Christ and the efficacy of his death.

If we compare the two hypotheses together, we shall perhaps be sensible that the evidence preponderates in behalf of the former. More than this we cannot venture to assert. We can have *no infallible knowledge* respecting future rewards and punishments, beyond what is communicated in the Bible. Presumptions from the divine attributes and government, from the constitution of man and from some real or supposed analogies, though they may not be wholly destitute of weight, are inadmissible, when the appeal is made professedly to scripture; by employing them, we abandon, or seem to abandon, our avowed design, and are in danger of violating the simplicity of our reasoning and lessening its force. This is the common error of writers in the present controversy; and it is an error from which, as we have before intimated, even Mr. Simpson does not appear to us to be altogether free.

---

* Or, by parity of reason, that of annihilation.

There is a wide difference between erecting an article of faith on minute verbal criticism—a practice which we must strongly discountenance—and availing ourselves of such criticism, in order to shew that scriptural phraseology is not necessarily to be interpreted by the ideas and language of a modern age. To this latter object the author of these Essays, &c. has limited his attention. Though his own judgment, on the matters in discussion, be already formed, he is, nevertheless, candid and usually discriminating. In his method of considering the topics selected by him, he has followed the examples of Clarke and Sykes on questions of yet greater moment. We shall not indeed affirm that he has traced the meaning of scripture with all the accuracy and learning of those celebrated divines, or with equal certainty. Still, his labours may guide and assist those of younger theologians, who, however, will do well to recollect that even the rule of interpreting scripture by itself, requires a judicious and cautious application.

Art. II.—*Strictures on some of the Publications of the Rev. Herbert Marsh, D. D.* Intended as a Reply to his Objections against the British and Foreign Bible Society. By the Rev. Isaac Milner, D. D. F. R. S. Dean of Carlisle, and President of Queen's College, Cambridge. London: printed for Cadell and Davies, &c. 1813. 8vo. pp. 419.

"In all accusations, whether public or private, when thou hast made a sufficient defence, enter not into needless matters of ostentation, or such further vindication as is not necessary."* Had the Dean of Carlisle acted upon this maxim, he would have appeared, in the present controversy with more advantage, both as a writer and a man. To the objections of Dr. Marsh against the British and Foreign Bible Society, he replies, no doubt, with considerable ease and complete success. This undertaking was neither difficult nor requisite: it was to slay the slain. Learning and ability very inferior to Dr. Isaac Milner's, had already obtained a victory over the most formidable of the Anti-biblists. The argument was intelligible to unlettered men, to the plainest and humblest capacities. We might therefore have been spared a volume which consists of five parts, besides an appendix; a volume of which much is irrelevant and much personal, in which we meet with numerous instances of tautology and egotism, and which, although it may display the talents of the author as a disputant, and serve to uphold his reputation within the precincts of his University, will not, we conceive, obtain any permanent existence among literary and theological productions.

The reasoning of the President of Queen's, is far better than his arrangement. But what we chiefly admire in his work, is the manner in which he speaks of Protestant Dissenters, and his inclination to commend, in one view, some of them whose religious sentiments greatly differ from his own.

---

* Corbet's *Self-employment in Secret*, an excellent Manual of Devotion and Christian Prudence.

> "It is my decided opinion," says he, (p. 150), "that the differences among such Protestant churches as deserve the name of orthodox, can never be insisted on to any good purpose, unless the representation of them be accompanied with the statement of other important collateral truths,—such as, that the differences, either entirely, or nearly, respect subordinate matters; that there is an agreement among them in rejecting the grand errors and corruptions of the church of Rome; and that there is a further agreement in the fundamental doctrines of Christian faith and practice."
>
> "In regard to such classes of Protestants as are not esteemed orthodox in their tenets, I judge it better to be silent. For although I am far from being disposed to speak of them either with animosity or disrepect, my knowledge of their several peculiarities in doctrine does not enable me to make the requisite distinctions without some danger of misrepresentation. The co-operation, however, of the Socinians with the other friends of the Bible Society, in the good work of disseminating Bibles, appears to me to be a notable instance of candour and moderation, worthy of the notice of believers of all denominations. They are supposed, in general, to prefer a different version of the scriptures; but if they have given up the lesser consideration for the sake of disseminating Bibles with greater advantage, churchmen surely will both be glad of the event, and approve of the principle that led to it."*

We know whom the Dean intends to designate by the appellation *the Socinians:* and we should not have been sorry if, in this instance at least, he had made those enquiries, and been acquainted with those *distinctions*, which would have guarded him from the possibility of *misrepresenting* their "peculiarities in doctrine;"—a sort of accuracy and justice that we might the rather have expected from one, much of whose time and attention has been devoted to the history of the Christian church.* The *main fact* however is such as he describes it. *Unitarians*, in common with many enlightened men, both in and out of the Establishment, do not acknowledge the infallibility of King James's translation; yet, feeling as strong an attachment to revelation and its records as any of those, whether conformists or nonconformists, who, in our author's judgment, deserve the name of *orthodox*, they are willing to join in the most practicable measures for the circulation of the scriptures.

There is nothing in the present volume which we more disapprove than the eagerness of the Dean of Carlisle to animadvert on former publications of Dr. Marsh's. We shall not deny that those publications may be fairly open to censure; nor, universally, could we controvert the strictures which they have received from this writer. But we decidedly protest against the practice of an author's professing to answer, solely or mainly, certain positions of an antagonist upon a certain subject, and yet availing himself of that opportunity of questioning his merits in other departments of literature and of arraigning his arguments upon foreign topics. Dr. Marsh, it is true, had thrown out what the President of Queen's is fond of denominating *a challenge:* he had asked, "Whether his opponents have laboured harder than he has done to promote the study of the scriptures?" A direct answer to this inquiry, would have been more pertinent and satisfactory than the recriminations which Dean Milner has employed in such abundance: and the honour of the learned dignitary, and still more that of his cause, would not have been endangered by his receiving this implied boast with the silence which it deserved. (262)

---

* See p. 175.

* P. 273, 274.

Biblical criticism is somewhat depreciated by the writer of these Strictures.* It is a familiar maxim that "a man is against reason when reason is against *him*;" and we suspect that the Dean of Carlisle may occasionally find the test of Biblical Criticism an unwelcome application. Nevertheless, there is, in truth, no other method by which Protestant students and ministers can legitimately advance to the interpretation of the sacred text; and we so highly estimate Dr. Marsh's qualifications and services in this part of the field of theology that we heartily wish he had never quitted it for the devious and thorny paths which he has been fond of traversing. Election squibs and political pamphlets, are not more unworthy of such a man than anti-biblical publications.

On the abilities and skill of Dr. Isaac Milner as an interpreter of the scriptures we pass no judgment. But when he tells us that, even at a very early period of his academical life,† he would not join in a petition to the legislature, for relief from subscription to theological articles which, at that time, it was impossible for him to have examined, we may be allowed to intimate that he was not likely to investigate the Sacred Volume with impartiality and effect. We are happy that he declares himself a believer in the doctrine of universal redemption.* Yet the texts which he adduces in support of it, do not strike us as decisive of the question; they must be expounded, we think, of the fact of the gospel being embraced by Gentiles as well as Jews. The argument of the apostle in Rom. v. &c. might with more propriety have been cited by our author.

His eulogy on the Athanasian Creed is too curious to be withholden from our readers: (357).

> "The creed, which takes its name from Athanasius, was composed for the express purpose of rejecting many ancient heresies, which it has accordingly done with admirable conciseness and perspicuity. And by the help of the parochial minister, even the poor and unlearned may be enabled to comprehend the meaning and to see the force of its several clauses."

We had no doubt of the Dean of Carlisle being an anti-catholic; and this sincerely at least, if not justly. But we did not expect that with his Strictures on Dr. Marsh's publications in regard to the Bible Society he would mix any declaration of his own opinions upon a topic so perfectly unconnected with his avowed design. Neither did we look for a section on his *personal infirmities* [of health], which, however, we sincerely lament, nor for any mention of his services to the University, his Lectures on Chemistry, &c. &c.

---

* 264, &c. † P. 361.

* Pp. 370, 374, 375.

He takes credit to himself, (298) for having, when Vice-chancellor in 1792, " by his vigorous exertions, effected the banishment of a very turbulent member of the University, on account of his disaffection to the ecclesiastical constitution of this country." At this distance of time, we shall not enter into the merits of the case, as it regards the accuser or the accused,—the learned and worthy person in whose exile from Cambridge the Dean rejoices. We will only beg our readers to mark THE FACT* that, by the acknowledgment of Dr. Isaac Milner himself, "the Vice-chancellor in 1792" acted in the double capacity of procurer† and of judge: " by his *vigorous exertions* he *effected* the banishment" of Mr. Frend! His motives for speaking of this affair in his Strictures on *Dr. Marsh*, may be shrewdly conjectured by some who recollect the circumstances of the trial.

It seems to have been the singular lot of the President of Queen's College that " when Vice-chancellor in 1792," and " when again Vice-chancellor in 1810," he had to encounter the opposition of *turbulent* spirits and " outrageous offenders." Not being University men, we are perhaps more dispassionate observers and hearers of what passes on the banks of Cam and Isis than the inhabitants of those favoured spots. May we not therefore be permitted to hint that an inordinate love of power, an injudicious display of authority, an unseasonable creation of new and obnoxious officers, might possibly aggravate evils which wiser measures and a more conciliatory spirit would have mitigated, if not prevented? It is not enough that the proceedings of men in high and responsible stations be *legal:* they must, at the same time, be the result of a truly liberal and comprehensive mind.

In these Strictures we perceive with concern many indications of a solicitude,—a restless solicitude,—about personal credit and importance: we meet with expressions of those " human passions" which, as we are taught by numerous examples, can disturb the quiet even of an University. The general fame of Dr. Marsh, as a scholar and biblical critic, as a man of talents and erudition, stands deservedly high not only in Cambridge but wherever learning is cultivated. Nor are the faculties and the acquirements of Dean Milner of a common order. Rivalries and jealousies, however, both literary and ecclesiastical, may haunt academic shades: and we fear that the controversy between these two eminent men will proceed, as it begins, much more in a discussion of matters respecting themselves, as clergymen and gownsmen, than in a calm consideration of the demands of the Bible Society on public favour.

The more we are aquainted with that Society, the stronger is our conviction of its simplicity, usefulness and moment. It is precisely for this reason that we deplore the inequalities of the Dean of Carlisle's Vindication of it, and the undue share which Dr. Marsh, *as Dr. Marsh*, obtains in his thoughts and strictures. Our patience will be almost exhausted, should his antagonist reply in an octavo volume, of four hundred and nineteen pages. Such a tax upon our time and feelings we most earnestly deprecate. We cannot be spectators of this conflict, unless the combatants engage with each other in moderately-sized pamphlets. And, were we members of their church, we would say to them, " Sirs, ye are brethren! Why do ye thus wrong your own reputation, and the interests of the *ecclesiastical constitution of this country?*"

---

* The readers of the antibiblical controversy are familiarized with *italics* and with ROMAN CAPITALS.

† Dr Kipling appeared as such in the process.

N.

ART. III. *Two Discourses, the former of which was preached at the Unitarian Chapel, in Mosley Street, Manchester, Dec.* 30, 1812. Before the Cheshire and Lancashire Unitarian Book Society, and the latter at the Chapel in Cross-Street, Manchester, January 10, 1813. By Joseph Bealey. 8vo. pp. 64.

ART. IV. *Jesus Christ, a Man of Sorrows and acquainted with Grief. A Sermon preached at the Chapel, at Cockey, in Ainsworth, April* 4, 1813 By Joseph Bealey. 8vo. pp. 28. Johnson and Co.

These discourses derive a mournful interest from the untimely decease of their much respected author, and may be considered as his bequest to his denomination and the world.

The last sermon is an eloquent and affecting picture of the humiliation and sufferings of Jesus Christ, considered as a proper man, and is a happy example of the power of Unitarian Christian principles, evangelically applied, to touch the tender passions, and to promote (what is sometimes called) experimental religion. Of the 'Two Discourses,' the first is a judicious statement of the importance of the Scriptures, and an earnest and persuasive exhortation to the study of them, founded upon the reasonableness and simplicity of their doctrines; and the second is a rational exposition of 2 Cor. iv. 4. and a practical view of the influence of " the God of this world," prejudice and interest, in blinding the mind and hindering the perception and acknowledgment of the truth. In the conclusion of this Discourse the author considers the unhappy effects of religious blindness, and thus modestly and movingly introduces the history of his own recent and well-known change of sentiment, with regard to the person and office of Christ:

> " Other instances might be mentioned of doctrines, which are commonly accounted orthodox, which have a similar tendency and effect; but I shall rather proceed to notice a degree of obscurity which attends the doctrines that are generally called Arian, as they have been held by many. I hope no one here present will accuse or suspect me of wishing to assume any improper consequence to myself, if I take the liberty of speaking a little to this point from my own experience. Probably it may be known to some who now hear me, that the doctrines I have just mentioned are those which I have embraced through the greatest part of my life;

and I must candidly confess that I have always felt some degree of embarrassment arising from them. I trust you will excuse my mentioning one or two instances of this. It must be evident to all who are acquainted with the system, that there is a great degree of darkness attending it with respect to the nature of Christ in his supposed pre-existent state, of which no one has ever been able to form a clear and decisive judgment, upon any good authority.

"Again, with regard to his death, and the purposes which it was designed to answer; for my own part, I have never been able, since I have been capable of thinking seriously upon the subject, to believe that it was intended either to pacify the wrath of God, and dispose him to the exercise of mercy, or to satisfy his justice by paying, as it were, a full equivalent for the sins of men; nor was able to assign any other ends which it could rationally be supposed to accomplish, than to manifest, in the most affecting manner, the holiness of God's nature, and his hatred of sin, at the same time that he extended mercy to sinners; to give the most striking pledge and assurance of his readiness to forgive the sins of the truly penitent, by the solemn ratification of the covenant of grace; and thus to hold out the strongest encouragement and motive to repentance. Yet, I had a general persuasion that the language of scripture implied something more than this, which I was not able to explain; and, upon that principle, I have often quoted passages of scripture, or otherwise expressed myself in such a way as might naturally convey an idea of there being some further efficacy in the death of our Lord, without attempting to define wherein it consisted.

"Further, with respect to the agency of Christ in the government of the Church, regarding him both as the procurer and immediate dispenser of spiritual blessings, I have not scrupled to say that we were to look to him for them, in the exercise of humble faith; though both his own express directions, and the language, as well as the practice of his apostles, forbade me to encourage such an idea as that of praying to him for them; and I think it must be evident to every one that there is a considerable degree of confusion attending such views as these. I apprehend it is a certain matter of fact that those who are called Arians, have not, in general, been very explicit in stating minutely their sentiments, with regard to some important doctrines of Christianity; and I think it must appear, from the circumstances which I have now mentioned, that this is sufficiently accounted for by the embarrassments which result from the system itself, without charging those who embrace it with any wilful duplicity or disingenuousness; for it is surely impossible for any one to explain a subject fully and precisely to others, upon which he has not clear and definite conceptions in his own mind.

"Having ventured to say so much with reference to myself, I hope you will pardon me, and not attribute my conduct to a vain wish of giving any undue importance to my own views and feelings, but rather to an honest desire of serving the cause of truth, and of inciting others to serious inquiry, if I take the liberty of mentioning further, that about a year ago, I was incidentally led to give a more particular attention to one view of the agency of Christ, which was his being supposed to be, under God, the creator of the world, than I had ever paid to it before; the result of which was that I found myself compelled to relinquish the ideas which I had entertained upon that subject, as not being sufficiently supported by the scriptures. I then felt it to be my duty to enter into a more serious and close examination into the grounds of the general system which I had long adopted, and into the scriptural evidence which there is for what is commonly called the Unitarian doctrine, with respect to the person of Christ; against which I ought to be ashamed to acknowledge that I had hitherto indulged a general prejudice, so far as to prevent my giving it a fair and full examination.

"After much anxious, and, I hope I may add, serious and faithful application of my best powers of judgment to the subject, I was at length constrained to renounce the views which I had entertained with regard to the person of Christ, and brought to a full conviction that he was, in nature, only a man; though eminently distinguished from all other men, both by the unparalleled excellency of his character, and by the high dignity and importance of his office, as well as by the extraordinary powers with which he was invested; and firmly believing this to be the genuine doctrine of the gospel, I cannot but feel it to be my indispensible duty, by all fair and honourable means, to recommend it to the attention of others, and to endeavour to promote its diffusion among my fellow christians. A consciousness of the prejudices which I have myself too much indulged, though I trust not from any wilfully wrong motive, ought indeed to make me exceedingly candid towards those who are still subject to their unhappy influence; but, at the same time, I think it ought to render me the more earnest in my endeavours to persuade them to divest themselves of all such improper prepossessions, and to examine the scriptures fairly and impartially, in order to learn thence what are the genuine truths of the gospel."

Mr. Bealey bears witness in several parts of these publications to the unusual spirit of religious inquiry now prevailing in Lancashire; and mentions ("Two Discourses," p. 36, 37) the late mission of Mr. Wright as contributing much to this happy change.

We cannot dismiss the Sermons without expressing our sympathy with the numerous surviving friends of Mr. Bealey; our hope that his true Christian example will long operate in favour of truth and righteousness; and our prayer that the Lord of the Christian harvest may raise up labourers in the place of this and other servants of Christ called to their rest!

Art. V. *Short Observations and Reflections upon select Passages of Scripture, for every Sunday in the Year.* By the Rev. John Tremlett. Vol. II. London. Sold by Johnson and Co. St. Paul's Church-yard, and the Booksellers, Norwich. 1813. Price 4s.

With pleasure we hear that the reception of the former volume of this work [Mon. Rep. VI. 177.] has been so favourable as to induce the author again to employ his pen. Of the tendency of the volume before us we can speak with unqualified approbation: it unites, in the happiest manner, the strict morality and the amiable cheerfulness and tenderness of the Christian religion. The unadorned simplicity of its style shews that it is the pure effusion of the writer's own heart. The rational and pious parent will rejoice to call the minds of youth to "Reflections," so fitted to teach them the enjoyment of all that is excellent in this passing scene, and the attainment of that "crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give unto all them that love his appearing."

Art VI. *The Sufferings of Unitarians in former Times urged as a Ground of Thankfulness for their recovered Liberties.* A Discourse preached at Essex Street Chapel, July 25, 1813, being the First Sunday after "The Act to Relieve Persons who impugn the Doctrine of the Trinity" had received the Royal Assent. By Thomas Belsham. 8vo. pp. 54. Johnson and Co.

In this Thanksgiving Sermon, Mr. Belsham has drawn up a brief but interesting Unitarian martyrology, to which he has added some suitable and animated reflections.

The Sermon is printed by the Unitarian Book Society,—a distinction to which it is well entitled. It will be read with pleasure, not only by the members of the preacher's denomination, but also by all the friends of liberty: and we are happy in the opportunity of commending it to general attention.

The effect of the Trinity Bill is likely to extend beyond the mere repeal of persecuting statutes: the new law will give the tone to the public sentiment and language; and we confidently expect that in a few years Unitarians will be as little vexed with reproachful names as with political prosecutions. Since the Trinity Bill passed, indeed, a pamphlet has been published, in which the invidious and unhandsome epithet *Socinian*, is unsparingly thrown at them;* but we consider this as nearly one of the last attempts to fix on them a name which they disown, and which they who use it know to be as inappropriate as it is offensive.

Art. VII. *A Speech*, intended to have been spoken at a General Meeting of the Inhabitants of the Borough of Leeds, *on the Catholic Question*, 22nd January, 1813. 8vo. 1s. Johnson and Co.

The author of this *Intended Speech* is Mr. Jervis, the Dissenting Minister, who, like many other of his brethren, has endeavoured to resist the "No Popery infatuation." The 'speech' is in the manly spirit of liberty, but at the same time in the softened tone of charity. On a subject so thoroughly discussed, Mr. Jervis has given his pamphlet an appearance of novelty by the citation of a series of authorities,—ecclesiastics and statesmen of various parties, on behalf of the Catholic Claims.

One passage of the Speech we are at a loss to understand. The author disavows "hostility to the national church," and adds, p. 12,

> "From my knowledge of Dissenters in general, it is only doing them justice to declare, as my unqualified opinion, that they are by no means inimical, but that *they are generally friendly to the established religion of their country.*"

By the "established religion" is meant, we presume, the Established Church; but how can Dissenters be friendly to an Establishment, from which they separate, at no small cost, precisely because they conscientiously believe it not to be a pure Christian establishment?

Art. VIII. *Remarks on the Bishop of Lincoln's Charge, delivered to the Clergy of his Diocese*, 1812. By John Disney, D. D. F. S. A. 8vo. 1s. 6d. Johnson and Co.

We have here another defence of the Catholic Claims and of universal Religious Liberty: the name of the author will be a sufficient pledge to our readers that the "Remarks" are judicious, pertinent, temperate, convincing and conciliatory. They are moreover seasoned with pleasantry, which renders them amusing and recommends the author's argument, which is close and solid.

---

* "Dr. Watts no Socinian."

ART. IX. *The Importance of the Sriptures*, and the Causes to which the general Mis-Interpretation of them is owing. By William Johns. 12mo. pp. 60. Longman and Co.

Mr. Johns's object, in which he appears to us to have succeeded, is to establish the following rule in the reading of the scriptures,—

"—to receive what is plain and explicit as certain and indubitable; to reserve what is doubtful and obscure for further investigation; and, by no means and on no account, to wrest the sense of what is hard to be understood, so as to contradict that which is obvious and plain." (P. 55.)

Examples of judicious interpretation of the scriptures illustrate and recommend the author's "Rule:" e. g.

"Acts xvii. 11. Many adduce the passage thus translated" (*strange gods*) "as a proof of the *incarnation of deity:* one of the four doctrines, according to Dr. Buchanan, (see *Christian Researches in India*) which the scriptures reveal the most plainly and explicitly of all others! This passage ought to be translated thus—'Others said, he appears to be a proclaimer of strange (i. e. foreign) demons; because he preached to them Jesus and the Resurrection.' By *demons*, the Athenians, being heathen idolaters, meant an intermediate order of beings between God and man, some of which were good and some evil. If therefore the incarnation of any deity be implied in the expression, it must be some Pagan deity or demon." (P. 30.)

"John i. 1, is adduced in proof (*of*) the same doctrine (the incarnation of deity). It is alleged that no Unitarian interpretation of this passage is tolerable; that no Socinian torture will here serve our turn; but that on the orthodox or Trinitarian hypothesis every thing is easy, consistent and satisfactory. Let us try this passage fairly upon Trinitarian principles, and we shall soon see whether it will end in the consistency so much boasted of, or involve us in the most palpable absurdity. By *logos* or *word*, in the first clause, say the orthodox, is meant God the Son—the second person in the Trinity; and by *theos*, God, in the second clause, is meant God the Father, or the first person in the Trinity. Now instead of the terms *logos*, the word, and *theos*, God, let us substitute the orthodox explanations, and mark the result. 'In the beginning was God the Son, and God the Son was with God the Father, and God the Son was God the Father.' Or thus: 'In the beginning was the second person in the Trinity, and the second person in the Trinity was with the first person in the Trinity, and the second person in the Trinity was the first person in the Trinity.'" (Pp. 31, 32.)

"2 Pet. i. 4. 'That ye must be *partakers of the divine nature*.' If it had so happened that this expression had no where in the scriptures been applied to Christians, but that it had been said in reference to Christ, that he had been partaker of *the divine nature* (the very language assumed by reputed orthodoxy) how loud would be the language of triumph over the scripture-torturing Socinians; in how contemptuous a manner would every effort at explanation be treated, how hardily would it be asserted that they denied the very words of scripture in their plainest, most obvious meaning, and, in a word, what would not be said against them, infidels, deists, &c. &c. Yet notwithstanding all this, had it been expressly said of Christ, that he was *partaker of the divine nature*, and the expression had never been applied to Christians, nor supposed to be applicable to them, the Socinian torture would have been the only true method of explaining the expression, and it would not have evinced the deity of Christ, any more than it does at present the deity of all true Christians." (Pp. 33, 34.)

We agree with Mr. Johns, (p. 43, *note*,) that "to speak correctly, we should always say the *deity*, and never the *divinity*, of Christ. All Christians believe in his divinity or divine commission."

Upon the whole, we know of no Unitarian tract fitter than this, to be put into the hands of serious, intelligent religious inquirers. To unlearned Christians it seems peculiarly suitable, since the author, though evidently a scholar, has given all his criticisms, (and some of these are of no mean worth,) in *plain English.*

Art. X. *The Comparative Tendency of Unitarianism and Calvinism to promote Love to God and Love to Man,*—considered in a Discourse delivered at Brighthelmstone, on Wednesday, June 30, 1813, before the Southern Unitarian Society. By W. J. Fox. 12mo. pp. 34. Johnson.

Do we love a father or a tyrant? Does man win our charity more as a brother and co-heir, or as one of another *caste*, doomed by divine decree and hurried along by an Almighty hand to endless degradation and woe?

These questions appear to us to sum up the controversy between Unitarians and Calvinists; and we are happy to report that Mr. Fox has answered them with great pertinence and ability. His sermon is, indeed, of rare excellence. We cannot give an abstract of it, for it is itself a compendium of thought and argument; and for brevity and simplicity, as well as judicious reasoning and lively remark, we do unfeignedly recommend it to our readers, and to our (now, happily, numerous) Unitarian Book Societies.

Art. XI. *Charta Religionum*: A Chart of the Sects and Denominations into which the Christian World is divided. By John Williams Morris, Minister of a Congregation of General Baptists, Southover, Lewes. Folio Sheet. 1s. On Canvas and Rollers, 4s. 6d. Baxter, Lewes: Darton and Co, London.

A Map of Religions is an ingenious idea: well executed, such a work would be a proper ornament for the walls of school-rooms and vestries. As a first attempt, the map before us has great merit, and we can honestly recommend it to our readers: in a second edition, we would advise Mr. Morris to be a little more precise in his definitions, to discard the names of some obscure authors, and to check an evident bias towards some of the denominations. In this last respect, Mr. Evans's *Sketch*, which the author professes to follow, is not a bad model for his imitation.

We like not the term *Humanitarian*. It is to our ears as the word *Trinity* was to John Calvin's, "barbarous." No Christians take it upon themselves, and therefore it is a needless distinction.

In such a work as this, a place should have been allotted to those Protestant Dissenters, increasing, we believe, in numbers, who, though not Quakers, deny the perpetuity of Baptism. A happy name is wanted for them; but until a better be found, they must, we suppose, be contented with that of *Anti-Baptists*. Of these, a sub-division, (not natives of Ireland either,) baptize without water; they may be called, vulgarly, *Dry Baptists*,—learnedly, Pro-Baptists.

Art. XII. *A Poetical Epistle to to the Rev. John Grundy*, occasioned by his Lectures on the Doctrines of Christianity. By William Hampson. 8vo. pp. 16, 1813.

Mr. Grundy is, we apprehend, well known to our readers as an able and successful advocate of the Unitarian cause; in that character Mr. Hampson addresses him in this "Poetical Epistle," which may not gain for the writer a distinguished place in the temple of the muses, but which assuredly entitles him to the better distinction of an enlightened, philanthropic Christian.

Art. XIII. *A Letter to Mr. William Cobbett,* on an Article in his Political Register, of Saturday, May 15, 1813, entitled "The Trinity," with Remarks on his Political Writings, By a Friend to Christianity. 8vo. 2s. Mozley, Gainsborough; Longman and Co. London.

"A fit rebuke to a ludicrous Infidel."*

OBITUARY.

Aug. 26, 1813.

Mr. John Cross.

Mr. John Cross, (whose sudden and much lamented death was noticed on the Cover of the last Repository,) was born at Taunton, March 13th, 1745. His father died while he was very young; by which event the charge of him and two other children devolved upon his mother. She is represented as having been a woman of great worth and superior understanding; and from her he probably derived the seeds of that piety and conscientious regard to duty, which seem to have early and constantly distinguished him. He resided for some years with a respectable attorney at Nottingham; but I do not find that he ever entered regularly into the profession himself. When he was about thirty years of age he was received into the family of William Marquiss of Lansdown, (then Lord Shelburne,) in whose service, and afterwards that of his eldest son, he continued till near the death of the latter. He held (I believe) the situation of land steward; but for several years before the death of the old Marquiss, he was rather to be regarded as his confidential agent and secretary. His lordship spoke of him as his friend, and treated him with great consideration and kindness; and the recollections of that period were particularly interesting to the good old man, as his situation made him acquainted with several great and good men, such as Price, Priestley, &c. and gave him a personal knowledge of many of those characters which are distinguished in the annals of the times.

Soon after Mr. Cross left the Lansdown family he came to reside in Exeter, about three years before his death. His amiable disposition, his evident desire to do good, and his willingness and readiness to be employed in the service of others in any way in which he could promote their welfare,—all deriving from Christian principles and affections that peculiar character which religion alone can give to benevolence,—soon procured him the esteem of all who knew him and were able to appreciate his worth. Among the young he was particularly beloved. Though often disabled by bodily indisposition from the enjoyment of social intercourse, he had none of the peevishness which too often renders old age a source of disquiet, and prevents its real excellencies from ensuring the reverence and love of the youthful mind: he had learnt patience and resignation in the school of affliction; and his piety, founded on just ideas of the character and dealings of Providence, supported those dispositions which made his hours of ease tranquil and cheerful. He delighted in seeing the young innocently happy; and still more in contributing to make them so.

Our friend was not distinguished by vigour of intellect; but he possessed great good sense, and an humble inquiring turn of mind; and as his judgment was not clouded by prejudice, or perverted by selfishness, his views of duty were clear, decided, and correct. The moral character often receives its peculiar features from the mental characteristics; and his virtues were not of the commanding kind: but they were such as to deserve and to conciliate respectful esteem.

---

* Title of Simon Browne's Remarks on Woolston.

At Lady-day last he became an inmate in my family. The memory dwells with mournful complacency on the little traits of benevolent kindness which marked his domestic character. He loved the playful simplicity of children; and he might often have been taken for the grandfather of mine. Always desirous to avoid giving trouble to others, always attentive to their comforts, he seemed to have no wish but to possess the affectionate regard of those with whom he resided: and that he did possess.—His time was so employed as to afford him much rational interest and improvement. He was constant in the discharge of the duties of piety. His first reading in the day was always directly religious, calculated to exercise and strengthen his Christian principles. He was next accustomed to read works of a serious but more argumentative description. His evenings he wished to spend, as much as he could, in cheerful social intercourse with his friends.

I cannot hesitate to speak of him as a conscientious, pious, benevolent, humble Christian; and with such a character of mind, it is not wonderful that he should be able to look forward to his great change without dismay. In submission to the divine will, he wished that it might be sudden: and he was spared from those lingering sufferings, and that total loss of sight, of which he could not but be apprehensive.—Whilst on a visit to one whom he had described as his dearest friend, (Mr. Postans, of Sheriff's Lench, near Evesham.) he was suddenly called to his long home. As he was walking in the fields, he instantaneously expired, (in consequence of the bursting of a small blood vessel in the head,) without any appearance of suffering: and on the very evening when we had expected to welcome him to his home, I had the mournful satisfaction, of joining in paying the last mark of respect to his remains.

His income was very limited, but he made a liberal use of it. He regarded himself as accountable for all his talents; and he employed them as a faithful steward. He did good as he had opportunity; and I doubt not that he will meet with the approving sentence of his great Judge.

L. C.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

A million of men in arms! This was blazoned forth to the world in our public papers soon after we had finished our last report. The armistice was broken, and another power entered into the lists of this desperate, sanguinary and miserable conflict. Thus is Europe, which boasts of being the most enlightened part of the world, disgraced: thus are nations professing Christianity testifying their obedience to him whom they call their Lord, and who is emphatically styled in their hallowed writings the Prince of Peace. Nearly eighteen hundred years have elapsed since the kingdom of God was proclaimed, and the badge of its subjects was announced. " By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another." Had this precept been duly inculcated on the minds of these combatants, is it possible that such a number of professing Christians could have been collected together into one district for the purpose of destroying each other? But the ways of peace are not yet known: its advantages are not duly appreciated. The religion of Christ is in the mouths of all, but how little does it appear to be in their hearts.

We do not consider this subject as the worldly politician. It fills us with anguish for the deplorable state of mankind. The glorious light of the gospel has shone upon them, but men have preferred darkness to it. Hence Europe is in its present degraded state, from which it cannot expect deliverance, till, with a renovated heart, it turns to that gospel, which it has so long trodden under foot. Where are the ministers of the Prince of Peace! Where are the elect of God to pour forth their supplications to their heavenly Father for their misguided brethren, and to implore a cessation of these horrible calamities!

The bloody battles that preceded the armistice seem only to have weakened the combatants in nearly equal degrees, and to one side a new prospect of success was opened. Austria it appears had offered its mediation, and a congress of ministers was expected at Prague. But negociations were on a sudden broken off; the armistice was declared to be at an end, and Austria proclaimed, in a manifesto, her reasons for siding with the confederates; and the sacrifices she had made to her great conqueror were sufficiently known to the world. The only wonder was, that after an alliance, which raised her abject state, and her concurrence in the great war against Russia, she could have any other reason but the probable hope, that Buonaparte, weakened by the disaster of the winter and his opening campaign, would be now incapable of standing against the triple confederacy, assisted by the forces and the name of the Crown Prince of Sweden.

The great contest now is, which shall have the superiority in the affairs of Europe, France or Russia; and on the part of Russia we find her declaring herself in favour of independence and liberty. These are fine words; but whose independence and liberty does she mean? Is Poland, one of the once great powers in Europe, to be included in this term? If so, and as the Austrian Manifesto concurs in these terms, and Prussia by regaining her own independence will be happy to make some sacrifice, why should not these three confederated powers shew their zeal in the good cause, by each giving up the part of which their predecessors robbed the kingdom of Poland, and thus restoring it to its ancient independence, and to that constitution which it had formed for its good government. Buonaparte, from his matrimonial connection, was prevented from taking this step when he was in Poland, and Gallicia was declared to be incapable of any arrangement, as he was bound by indissoluble ties to Austria to preserve to her her share of the plunder. His was the scheme of worldly policy without reference to justice. How noble will it not be in the confederate powers to prove the sincerity of their views, by thus restoring liberty and consideration to an ancient state, and in fact preserving that balance of power, of which so much is talked by the unsuccessful, and so little is thought when the tide is in their favour.

But, if Poland is not to be considered in this unhappy war, the next question is, whether the French influence in Germany should be allowed to exist, and if not, in what manner is that divided country to be governed? Is it to be restored to that chaos of states, the ancient republic of sovereigns, under the name of the Holy Roman Empire? Shall Austria regain the title of Emperor, with increased powers? When Buonaparte is driven beyond the Rhine, this question will occasion no small embarrassments; and Russia, having gained such a footing in Europe, will not easily be retained within its ancient limits. But these things will naturally be overlooked in this country, whose interest it is conceived to be, that Buonaparte should be conquered, and France a second time blotted out of the map of Europe. We cannot entertain the least predilection for this soldier of fortune, nor a wish for any power, that depends for its support on military government, on the conversion of the rational man into a mere engine of destruction. We view the great conflict with awe, relying on that supreme Power, who when he chastises, remembers mercy. The judgments of God are on the earth, may its nations learn righteousness.

The north-eastern part of Germany is the Aceldama. The combatants have met, and they tell their miserable tale different ways. In the north the Crown Prince of Sweden had the command, and he has maintained his superiority in that quarter, not only preventing the French from seizing Berlin, but driving them back from several of their posts. To the south also the French met with repulses, and Buonaparte was called away from that quarter to head his army, threatened by the main body of the confederates, under the command of their emperors, marching against Dresden. They had driven in the French armies in the advance of that town, and were approaching to take it by assault, on the very day that Buonaparte entered the place: and it is probable that his presence prevented the capture. The plan seems to have been laid with great judgment, and had it succeeded, the blow struck would have been decisive in the campaign: even in its failure some advantages were gained, which placed Buonaparte in a different situation from that in which he has hitherto been accustomed to astonish Europe.

The French by the military tactics they adopted with their Revolution overcame the powers opposed to them, who persisted in that system, by which they acquired great glory, as it is called, in arms. Thus in former times the Greeks, attached to their phalanx, fell an easy prey to the quickness of evolutions of the Roman Legion. But the repetition of defeat has instructed the confederate powers, and in this campaign they have pursued the French method, not waiting for the attack, but disposing their forces so as to act through a great extent of country. Thus they have a plan of their own to pursue, which every where interferes with that formed by Buonaparte: these chess players are brought nearer to equality than they have hitherto been, and there is no small probability that Buonaparte will be beat at his own weapons.

The river Elbe is the grand scene of all their actions. Various affairs had taken place upon it, which distracted the attention of the French, and the confederates, according to their well concerted plan, marched upon Dresden, and their balls fell in the town. They were repulsed after a very severe conflict, and a battle took place the next day, the result of which, according to the French account, amounted almost to a complete rout, and an immense loss of men, ammunition and baggage. One fact, however, is certain, that the move made by the confederates was not attended with the desired success: they were compelled to retreat into Bohemia, but in that retreat, by a fortunate concurrence of circumstances, they met with a large detachment of Buonaparte's army, which they put to the rout, taking the commander, several generals, and all their ammunition and baggage.

On balancing the accounts therefore of the contending parties, there is as yet no great occasion to boast on either side. If the churches of France resound with Te Deums on the two victorious days before Dresden, the tower guns have announced the successes of the confederates on the following days, who most probably have addressed the God of Hosts with equal praise and equal sincerity. But not to have been completely beaten, to have made such a stand, to be prepared for another attack, gives the preponderance in favour of the confederates, who, if they continue to act in concert, may drive the potent emperor from the Elbe, and in that case follow up their victories to the Rhine. The charm of invincibility is broken. The Russian winter, if it has not tamed the hero, has diminished the terror of his name. His legions, brought to act merely on the defensive, will be thinned by desertion, and the fact of the battalions of Westphalia, and of several officers of distinction going over to the confederates, must fill his mind with anxiety. Something more decisive will soon appear, and Germany will groan for years under a military government of one kind or another. Whether it will gain by the exchange of French for Cossacks time will prove.

In Spain the French have been completely foiled in their attempts to relieve the town and fort of St. Sebastian, which after a very brave defence fell by the assault of the former, and the surrender by capitulation of the latter. The town was made a mass of ruins, in consequence of the cannonade of the besiegers; and after its capture the guns of its defenders were turned upon it from the fort. The capture of this place was of great consequence to the allied army, as now Pampluna is the only fortified place remaining in possession of the French in the northern part of Spain. The ill success of the repeated attacks on Lord Wellington, will damp the ardour of the French, and the surrender of Pampluna is hourly expected. The French in the interior of Spain may then be expected to fall an easy prey to the conquering armies of the allies, and Spain delivered from the French may begin to resume its place among the powers of Europe. The Cortez however have not yet removed from Cadiz to the capital, but it cannot be expected to remain long in its present position. Its gratitude to the great deliverer has been manifested in titles and largesses, but we do not hear of the crown being offered to him. Whoever shall possess it will find it very different from what it has been under the wretched government of the Bourbons. The people have now acknowledged rights, and there is a mixed constitution. But still the clergy have too much influence. The formation of an auxiliary at Madrid, to our Bible Society would be a great advantage, and the spreading of a Bible in Spanish without note or comment may be a great measure in the recovery of that kingdom from its intellectual darkness. The bravery displayed by the Portuguese, and their free intercourse with the English, cannot fail also to have some effect upon their government, so that on the return of peace, the Peninsula will make a different appearance, from what it has done under the mismanagement of the two last centuries. But its influence in America will be cut off, and it must now depend on its own internal resources.

The Americans have found that the conquest of Canada is no easy matter, and that it would have been better to suffer a little inconvenience under existing calamities than to increase it by an appeal to arms. Their debates upon this subject shew, that they follow too closely the systems of the old world. Their attempts with Torpedoes have not hitherto had any success, yet they have been made with a great deal of industry. A bold adventurer has advanced with them near to one of our large ships, but he has found it not quite so easy to *bell the cat.* He does not however despair, and the Americans entertain sanguine hopes of his success, not recollecting that our ships having been forewarned will keep too good a look out to suffer the approach of any boat with such an implement of destruction in it. The spirits of alienation from the mother country continues to increase in Spanish America.

During the suspension of the mind from the sanguinary conflicts abroad several atrocious murders at home filled it with horror. Two of them were distinguished by the remarkable confessions of the unhappy perpetrators: of whom one imputed his guilt to a diabolical impulse, and the other maintained his innocence to the last of the murder, though he confessed that he was present at the scene. This notion of diabolical impulses is sanctioned by the writings of many learned men, and countenanced by our courts of law: yet we cannot but regret that it should find so much support in the higher, and should be brought into action by the lower classes. The worthy Granville Sharp was a great patron of this fanciful notion, which according to him was the cause of many of the actions of princely cabinets. But surely the passions of men uncontrolled by religion are sufficiently active without this foreign agency. Nor can we imagine the devil to have had more influence on the poor footman's mind than on that of the officers convicted of, and sentenced to death for, the murder of a brother officer in a duel. These latter murderers were saved from the gallows by the clemency of the Prince, who accompanied his pardon with a strong sentiment of indignation at their atrocious conduct, which was ordered to be read to every regiment in the service. They were all cashiered, and the most guilty of them was rendered incapable for ever of serving his majesty. By a strange prejudice these officers escape the abhorrence that is felt for the crime of Nicholson, who is supposed to have acted under diabolical impulse; yet surely if that is the case he is rather the subject of our compassion than those gentlemen, who in cool blood instigated their associates to murder each other.

The Unitarian Fund has had a meeting on the repeal of the act in support of the Trinity, and passed several appropriate resolutions on this subject. Mr. Alderman Goodbehere presided on this occasion, and the meeting did not confine itself to congratulations merely on the repeal of the act, but testified their wish and hopes, that every man, whatever might be his religious sentiments, might equally participate in every civil right with the rest of his countrymen. This is the true sentiment of Christian liberty: for all, who under the name of Christian, or of any particular sect of Christians desire under the former title to exclude non-Christians, or under the latter title to exclude Christians of a different denomination from themselves from civil rights, shew themselves to be unworthy of the Christian name, and make their religion a pretext for that lust of power and that pride of domination, which are expressly forbidden by our Lord and Master.' The attention of the Committee, in whom originated the application to parliament, was not forgotten, and in fact this matter ought to have been settled at the time of the agitation on Lord Sidmouth's bill. As it was then neglected, the committee very properly took it up, and though the act has never been and was not ever likely to be enforced, yet it was very proper, both for the sake of the country, and those who deny the Trinity, that such an act should no longer disgrace the statute book. A disposition has appeared indeed on the part of some Unitarians to make more of this business than it deserves; to cry it up as a most wonderful favour granted to Unitarians, and as a prodigious argument of the increased liberality of the times: but the fact is that the existence of the act was almost unknown in the country, more known indeed by far by Dissenters than Churchmen, and the Trinitarians had been for many years ashamed of it themselves: It is to be recollected, that this act was not originally made against these Dissenters of the three denominations, or that body which goes under the name of the Dissenting Interest, for at the tim of passing the act they were all Trinitarians; but against Churchmen, of whom many at that time as is the case now, denied the Trinity though they regularly attended the service of the Church, and professed to be its members.

Te Deums are singing on all sides for murderous battles: the thanksgiving of every pious Christian will be offered in this country for real blessings, for the bounty of Providence in a most plentiful harvest of every kind, got in under very favourable circumstances. When heaven thus showers down benefits, let not man be ungrateful. Let him manifest love not only to his friends but to his enemies, and thus hasten that time, when the swords shall be turned into plow-shares, and the spears into pruning-hooks. May thy kingdom O heavenly Father quickly come and thy will be done, here as it is in heaven!

CORRESPONDENCE.

The Obituary of the Rev. JOHN SIMPSON of Bath, we are sorry to postpone till next month, for want of room. Also two or three Articles of Intelligence.

We hasten to correct an undesigned misstatement in the Obituary of the Rev. W. Severn, (p. 550), concerning the treatment he received from his Father on his joining the Methodists. We are assured, from the best authority, that the behaviour of his family on that occasion was kind and liberal.

ERRATUM.

In page 536, col. 1, line 43 and 52, for the Rev. John Kentish, read the Rev. George Kenrick.

THE
MONTHLY REPOSITORY
OF
Theology and General Literature.

No. XCIV. OCTOBER. [Vol. VIII.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

Historical Account of the Warrington Academy.

(Continued from p. 579.)

On Dr. Aikin's death, the Rev. Nicholas Clayton, of Liverpool, became his successor as Tutor in Theology. This excellent person can scarcely be considered as connected with the Warrington Academy, for though he had at intervals been invited to each of the three professional chairs, the institution was almost past recovery before he, unfortunately for himself, submitted to be nominated Divinity Tutor. If not, however, on account of the Institution, yet surely on his own account, it is desirable to preserve such frail memorials as can now be collected of his highly estimable character.

Nicholas Clayton was the youngest of the three sons of Samuel Clayton, Esq. of Enfield Old Park, in the county of Middlesex, where he was born, probably about the year 1733.* He received the earlier part of his education, while quite a child, with Mr. Wood of St. Albans, and afterwards with Mr. Hawtyre of Chelmsford. At this latter place the Rev. Mr. Heckford, the dissenting minister, who was a great mathematician, took great notice of him, and probably laid the foundation of that taste for mathematical studies which he afterwards successfully cultivated under Professor Simpson and in company with George Walker at Glasgow. From Chelmsford he was entered as a Student at Northampton, and on Dr. Doddridge's death was, it is believed, for some time at Daventry, after which he joined his former fellow-student, Mr. Cappe, at Glasgow, where he also became intimate with Mr. Walker, and the late professor John Millar; whom the present writer has heard speak with great delight of these three associates of his early studies.

Where he settled immediately on his return from Glasgow, has not been discovered; but three or four years at least before he went to Liverpool, he was a minister at Boston in Lincolnshire, in connection with the same congregation which Dr. Kippis had left in 1750. He was invited thence, in the year 1763, to the newly-built Octagon at Liverpool, as the first minister of that, ultimately unsuccessful, attempt to introduce a liturgy among Protestant Dissenters. He preached the first sermon there on the fifth of June in that year.

---

* A sister of his married the Rev. Timothy Laugher, a respectable minister at Hackney, whom Dr. Price succeeded, in 1769. Dr. Kippis preached his funeral sermon from Prov. x. 7.

It may, however, be questioned, whether this be an accurate representation of the design of that establishment; which, it is believed, may be more correctly stated to have originated in the desire of some liberal Dissenters (who had not, on the one hand, any particular dissatisfaction with the mode of worship observed by their own ministers, or, on the other, the objections entertained by their forefathers to a form of public prayer, provided that it were not imposed), to give the many members of the established church whom they daily heard complain of the Book of Common Prayer, but who yet disliked the Dissenters' mode of extemporary prayer, an opportunity of joining in the use of a liturgy that should be free from all objection. This was at least one great object of the scheme of the Liverpool Liturgy,* and of the building of the Octagon Chapel, but the experience of nearly thirteen years having proved, that few of these malcontents within the pale of the Establishment had any inclination to support the improved scheme of public worship, unless it had proceeded from authority, and that the majority were in fact more attached to the church, corrupt as they acknowledged it, than to unpopular Christian truth, the few original projectors who were left, after their numbers had been reduced by deaths and removals (but not by desertions) feeling themselves no longer under any particular obligations to support the expence of this additional place of worship, determined to discontinue the use of the Liturgy, and sold their chapel to a clergyman of the established church, who is said to have been complimented by Bishop Porteus, (then of Chester) to whom he applied for a bishop's license (for it was never consecrated) on his having diminished the number of conventicles.†—The sermon with which Mr. Clayton concluded the dissenting services at the Octagon, on the 25th Feb. 1776 was published. From John iv. 19—23, he took occasion to explain the views with which the Liverpool Liturgy was originally composed, and the reasons for laying it aside: "that it was not projected by the dissatisfied among the Dissenters with their old forms, but by disinterested charity for the wants of dissatisfied members of the Establishment. These persons, however, not coming forward as was expected, the undertaking was laid aside. Its original projectors, not finding their disinterested attempt successful, were not disposed to give up the substance for the shadow."*

---

* In the composition of this Liturgy, it is thought by Mr. Nicholson to be not exactly true, as stated under the Article Godwin (No. 36 of Dr. Rotheram's pupils) [M. Rep. v. 428,] that he, Mr. Seddon and Mr. Holland each composed one service, and sent it for correction to the others; but that Mr. Godwin had the least share in the original composition, Seddon the most in the first and second, and Holland in the third. Partial transfers, however, were made, to accommodate the length for the occasion, and for some other reasons, in which it is believed some of them did not entirely concur with the rest. Mr. Nicholson has a sketch-copy (dated 1762), with an advertisement, stating that it is printed "for the learned and ingenious gentlemen for whom it is particularly intended," (probably the above three ministers, and such friends as they might choose to circulate it among) "requesting their correction as to general structure, sentiments or language.

† If it be really true that the bishop did thus congratulate Mr. Plumbe, his lordship must have been unacquainted with the proper legal meaning of the term "conventicle," which in 35 Eliz. c. 1., and 22 Car. ii. c. 1. is expressly defined an unlawful assembly. A place regularly registered for public worship, according to the terms of the 1 W. and M. c. 18, is a *lawful* assembly, and therefore *not* a conventicle.

Those who had been originally Dissenters went, with their minister, to the chapel in Benn's Garden, from which they had, mostly, separated. With the worthy minister of that chapel, the Rev. Robert Lewin, Mr. Clayton continued to be the colleague till his removal to Warrington, in the spring of 1781.—Those few who had been churchmen continued at the Octagon.

It had always been Mr. Clayton's custom, both before and after his engagement at the Octagon, very carefully to pre-compose his public devotional services. Such a practice was at all times suited to his own humility, and to his profound veneration for the perfections of the Deity. These services, as well as his more private family devotions, were certainly entitled to rank among the most perfect models of that difficult species of composition: and a more acceptable present could scarcely be offered to the public, than such a judicious selection of his sermons and prayers, as his worthy brother-in-law, their present possessor, would have it in his power to make. Nor can the writer of these notes perceive that it would be any violation of fraternal confidence, or offence against the unobtrusive modesty which characterized their author; who did not abstain from appearing before the public through any jealousy of his productions coming abroad, but was always ready, with true benevolence, to communicate his manuscripts to his friends, particularly his young friends, who wished to peruse them.†

Of his sermons, few persons have ever heard him preach without being struck with the excellence of the composition, and the originality and importance of the sentiments. It was a common remark of Dr. Aikin's, that he never heard a sermon from Mr. Clayton, that was not fit to be immediately sent to the press.

---

* Some very ill-tempered remarks on this sermon having appeared in the review of it in the Gentleman's Magazine for 1776, were replied to with considerable shrewdness by the Rev. John Palmer, then of Macclesfield, afterwards of Birmingham, in p. 450 of the same volume.

† A particular instance of this is recollected. When, in the year 1779, on an occasional visit to Warrington, he had preached an excellent sermon on the danger of being influenced by the judgment of the world from 1 Cor. iv. 3, 4. some of the students had meditated a request to be allowed to print it; when, hearing of their intention from Dr. Enfield, whom they had consulted on the subject, he sent them the manuscript with the following note; "Mr. C. desires to express his best thanks to those young gentlemen who had the goodness to hear his sermon with attention, and to judge of it with candour.—The sermon itself is at *their* service, if they think it worth the perusal. But as he has no reason to expect the same indulgence from *the world*, he trusts that upon reading it over, they will see sufficient reason for his declining a request, which it would give him pain to refuse."

The same originality characterized his conversation. The present writer has heard his uncle, Mr. Philip Holland, say, that he never was in Mr. Clayton's company without hearing either something entirely new, or something placed in an entirely new point of light.

Out of the line of his proper profession, he was particularly eminent in mathematics and natural philosophy. His services in this department at second-hand have already been noticed, p 430; but he was also, more directly, a great benefactor to the academy. He was not merely a theoretical, but a practical mechanic; he was an excellent workman, both with the lathe, and in cabinet-work. Some of the most accurate and highly finished articles in the Warrington-apparatus (long since lost in the wreck of Hackney College) were invented and finished by him, during his residence at Liverpool, for the use of his friend Dr. Enfield. An apparatus for demonstrating the laws of the composition and resolution of forces, another for the phænomena of the collision of elastic and non-elastic bodies, and a pair of whirling tables, the comparative velocities of each of which might be accurately adjusted according to a variety of rates, are recollected as particularly curious.

Of the manner in which he conducted his lectures, or of the subjects treated of in them, during the short period in which he held the theological chair, the present writer has no means of conveying to the public any accurate information. He thinks it probable, that, as there was at that time only one student in divinity, and he not in an advanced period of his course, his instructions to him might be conveyed chiefly in the way of familiar conversation, on the books which he might direct him to read, and in lectures on the scriptures, particularly on the New Testament. Whether any other students enjoyed the advantages of his instructions, he knows not.

In the spring of 1782, probably at the suggestion of Dr. Percival, who had before procured this honorary distinction for others of the tutors at Warrington, (see the life of Dr. Priestley) he received the diploma of Doctor in Divinity from the University of Edinburgh. The present writer happens to know, that the same compliment was, at the same time, preparing for him, by his proper Alma Mater, at the suggestion of his friends Dr. Wright and Mr. Millar of Glasgow.

On the dissolution of the Academy, in 1783, Dr. Clayton retired, with broken spirits and shattered health, among his former friends at Liverpool, from whose kind attentions he received such undoubted proofs of affection and strong attachment as greatly contributed to lessen the blow of an event by himself quite unforeseen; and though its remembrance could scarcely fail to embitter, as he himself says, in a letter now before the present writer, the future happiness of his life; yet these attentions had a great effect in restoring his tranquillity. In 1784 he received an invitation, first to Norwich, which he declined; but afterwards, probably in 1785, complied with a similar invitation from Nottingham, to become the colleague of his quondam fellow-student Mr. Walker. The religious sentiments and literary pursuits of these two eminent men were, in many respects, congenial, but scarcely any thing could be more dissimilar (to be both, in their respective ways, good), than their mode of conducting the public services, both as to prayer and preaching. During his residence at Nottingham, he was prevailed upon by his neighbouring brethren to print, but not to publish, an excellent discourse on prayer, preached at a meeting of ministers at Alfreton, in Derbyshire, in Aug. 1786. From 1 Thess. v. 25. (*Brethren pray for us*), he shews the great importance of a hearty union between ministers and people—that prayer is a natural consequence of affectionate good wishes, and a means of promoting them—prayer, that the great ends of the Christian ministry be answered in the real improvement of men's hearts in piety and charity, whatever becomes of the particular interests of any particular party; "uniting the love of truth with the superior love of virtue:" 2. The propriety of ministers praying for one another. They meet to enquire how they may best promote the good of men and of each other. "Let others aim to make men think alike, let us endeavour to make them act virtuously." "Generally speaking, the greatest candour, the greatest tenderness and the greatest generosity, are to be found in men of the best understanding and the most extensive knowledge."

It appears from the information of a gentleman who was a member of the congregation at Nottingham during Dr. Clayton's residence there, that he was very assiduous in discovering and secretly relieving, to a great extent, considering his means, objects of peculiar distress among the poor of that town; especially those, whose unobtrusive modesty particularly recommended them to his own congenial disposition. It was probable that this had also been his practice in former situations.

While resident in Liverpool, he had married, in 1765, Dorothy, the eldest daughter of Mr. James Nicholson, and sister to the present Mr. Matthew Nicholson of Liverpool; an excellent and amiable woman, but of very delicate health. She died in the year 1785, at the house of her brother-in-law, Mr. Clayton of Old Park.—Dr. Clayton returned to Liverpool in 1795, and died after a long state of declining health in the spring of 1797.

Having thus occupied so much of your valuable Miscellany with an account of the tutors at Warrington, perhaps your readers may be alarmed, Mr. Editor, at the prospect of a similar account of the students. But of these, for various reasons, a very select list will be presented. In the mean time, I must beg a page or two, probably of your next Number, for a few observations on the causes of the decline and ultimate dissolution of the Warrington Academy.

I remain, Sir,
Your's respectfully,
V. F.

EXTRACTS FROM NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Present State of the Mahometan Religion in Turkey.

[From Hobhouse's Journey, &c. &c. (see M. Repos. p. 433.) pp. 912—925.]

The descriptions of Rycaut (and much earlier writers might be mentioned) apply to the Mussulmans of Constantinople at this day, as much as to those of the seventeenth century, and the decay of their relative strength, as an European power, has but little affected their national character. The Mahometan religion has prevented, and ever will prevent, any material change in the individual condition, and consequently the character of the Turks. The light thrown upon the manners and customs of this people during the last hundred years, has left it unnecessary to disabuse the world on the subject of the religion of Mahomet. The times are past, when the Mussulmans were charged with believing that God is a corporeal Being, the author of evil, without providence, and not eternal; that the soul is mortal; that the devils are friends of Mahomet, and of God; that Venus is the proper object of worship; that man was created of a leach; and many other absurdities, originating only in the ignorance of their accusers.*

Into the doctrinal part of their religion the Turks do not enquire, but content themselves with an implicit faith in the one eternal Deity, in his angels, in the prophets, in the day of resurrection and judgment, in the decrees of God, and in the virtue of purification, prayer, alms and fasting. There are some of their priests, as might be expected, who disturb themselves with the subtleties of the controversialists, and engrafting upon the simplicity of the original law a variety of strange creeds, have established sects, the opinions of which, if we are to believe some writers, are not only different from, but altogether inconsistent with, the faith of Mahomet. Rycaut mentions one brotherhood, whose mystery, which it required a long noviciate to penetrate, consisted in a profession of atheism, and a practice of the most horrid debaucheries; but Islamism can no more be affected by such a perversity, than the religion of England by the monks of Medenham.

The sect does not, as far as I could learn, exist at this day, but institutions and practices no less foreign to the original faith, may still be found. Such are the invocations of dead, and the reverence of living, saints, a belief in prophecies,* omens and dreams and the power of amulets and charms, and the admission of numerous orders of Dervishes; the removal of all which excrescences, and the restoration of the simple Unitarianism of the Koran, it is the professed object of the Wahaubees to effect. These powerful sectaries have taken the holy cities, and overrunning all Arabia, and part of Syria, have menaced at the same time the Sophi of Persia and the Sultan of Constantinople, peremptorily inviting them to recognise the divine commission of Wahaub, the Unitarian Chief, and restore the faith to its primitive purity. Should the mission of this reformer accomplish its aim, and meet with general success, we may then expect to become acquainted with Mahometanism, such as it was in its infancy.

---

* Pope Pius II. in a Letter to the Sultan of the Turks, made the first charge; Cedrenus the second; the same Pope the third; Bartholinus of Odessa the fourth, and fifth; Polydore Virgil the sixth; Johannes Andreas the seventh; the great Selden, in his 4th chap. on the Syrian Deities, the eighth; and Euthemius Zigalenus the last. Sylburgius accuses Mahomet of having called the Blessed Virgin the sister of Moses; and Bartholinus of Odessa upbraids the Koran for saying that she was impregnated by eating dates. Those who would see the origin and refutation of these follies, may consult the second book of Adrian Reland's System of the Mahometan Theology.

Mr. Leibnitz says of it, that "'tis a kind of deism joined to the belief of some facts, and to the observation of some performances, that Mahomet and his followers have added, sometimes unluckily enough, to natural religion, but that have been agreeable to the inclinations of several countries:" and he adds, "we are obliged to that sect for the destruction of paganism in many parts of the world."†

To this brief and just exposition, and the subsequent eulogy of the religion, I shall only add, that its main doctrine has been allowed to be so similar to that of a great heretical Christian, that in times when theological controversies were more bitter than at present, sober treatises were written, to prove the conformity of the Mahometan belief with that of the Socinians; and that sect, on account of the irregularities of Adam Neuser, was charged with a conspiracy against Christianity, in conjunction with the Emperor of the Turks.‡ What was once thought a disgrace to Socinus, may now be considered an honour to the author of Islamism, who, when he declared *There is but one God, and Mahomet is his prophet*, may, considering the infirmities of human nature, be scarcely so much condemned for the imposture of the latter article, as praised for having promulgated the sublime truth contained in the first half of his concise creed. In short, of the prophet of Mecca we may say what Adrian Reland has pronounced of his commentator Kerabisensis, *This Arabian delivers some truth, covered over*

---

* The knowledge of future events is obtained, they think, by the constant practice of virtue, fasting, and humiliation. The *Etishmyshlerden*, "the attainers to the fulness of divine fervour," pretend to visions; yet Mahomet is declared in the Koran *Achir Pergamber* the last of the prophets, which the modern Mahometans have explained, as usual, to suit their own notions.—See Cantemir, Ottoman Hist. book i. p. 39. Tindal's translation.

† A letter from Mr. Leibnitz to the author of the Reflections upon the Origin of Mahometanism, dated Berlin, 1706.

‡ See Historical and Critical Reflections upon Mahometanism and Socinianism, translated from the French, London, 1712. *A Turk hearing a Polish Socinian discourse on the Trinity and Incarnation, wondered he did not get himself circumcised.* See the letter of Mr. Leibnitz, who, of the two, prefers the Mahometan, as more consistent than the Socinian.

with a shell of fiction, being destitute of divine revelation.

The rapid progress of Islamism has been attributed to the vicious licence permitted and promised to its votaries; but an Arabian impostor, many years after the Hegira allowed a much greater laxity of morals to his followers, and notwithstanding some success, his sect did not survive him. On the contrary, the prophet, in forbidding the use of wine, created a restriction to which the Arabians were not before accustomed; nor will any religion owe its dispersion and prevalence to a declaration of freedom of action; for it is consonant to the genius of man, to admire and follow systems abounding with rules and regulations, and even prescribing a conduct which seems to do violence to all the natural feelings and unbiassed inclinations of the human breast. Were this not the case, Fakeers, Monks, and Dervishes could never have existed: it would have been impossible that any man in the world should, like Uveis, the Mahometan, have established a sect and met with proselytes, whose pretensions to piety were founded on the extraction of all their teeth.

Mahomet was too wise to omit the palpable parts and outward ceremonials, which are the life and soul of all superstitions; which, in fact, are the superstitions. He was too wise, to make his Koran a promulgation of licences instead of restraints; his fasts and abstinences, his ablutions, his pilgrimage to Mecca, are so many meritorious mortifications, which have all tended to the propagation of his doctrine. To the same knowledge of the human mind may be attributed the miraculous relations of the Koran.

It has been before hinted, that a variety of principles and articles of faith have been invented by the founders of different Mahometan sects, but that these heresies do not engage the attention of the great body of the people. Some persons are inclined to think, that many of the higher classes in Turkey are very sceptical in matters of religion.* Of this I could form no judgment, but it was not difficult to see, that few, except the lower orders, retain that spirit of intolerance and bigotry which Mahometans are accused of displaying in all their commerce with Christians. A notion has very generally obtained, of their contempt and hatred of infidels so far prevailing, that it is established amongst them, that they may break any engagement with an unbeliever; but nothing is more unfounded than such a supposition, for the contrary conduct is expressly commanded by the Koran;† and they have been always notorious for their good faith in their commercial intercourse with other nations. "*How do we trade amongst the Turks*," enquires Mr Harley, who had fallen into the common error, "and trust the Mahometans, one of whose doctrines in the Alcoran is, not to keep faith with Christians? They have obtained it by a just, punctual, and honourable practice in trade, and you credit them without scruple, nay, rather than some Christians."*

---

* It must, however, be confessed, that in so great a nation there are many of the learned Turks who do not implicitly believe all that is said in the Koran, &c. Cantemir, Ottoman Hist. book i. p. 31 Tindal.

† See a Short System of the Mahometan Theology, book ii. sect. 25.

All the people of the East, except the Mahometans, as Montesquieu† thought, look upon all religions in themselves as indifferent, and amongst the Calmucks the admission of every kind of religion is a point of conscience. The truth is, the Mahometans themselves, whether originally from climate or otherwise, notwithstanding great apparent steadiness in their own faith, are perfectly tolerant in their practice; and I cannot help supposing that they entertain very charitable notions on this head, for I recollect a person of authority, to whom one of us had introduced our Albanian attendant Dervish, with the recommendation that he was a Mussulman, observing that he did not enquire into a man's faith, but his character, and that he presumed heaven would be wide enough for persons of all religions.‡ The generality of the Turks are at the same time exceedingly attentive to all the forms prescribed by their law, and perform their religious duties without either affectation or levity. The obligation to external piety is not confined to the priesthood. They pray in the streets and in their open shops at Constantinople, not for the sake of ostentation, since every one is equally pious, but to perform a portion of their civil duties. On the same principle, no one, whatever may be his private opinions, utters any sentiments disrespectful to the faith. Such a levity would be sedition, and a crime against the representative of the prophet; for the Sultan is the Vicar of Mahomet, and is the supreme head of the government, which is not less a theocracy than the ancient Jewish monarchy.

It has been established beyond doubt, by the writer who, in my humble judgment, has given the truest and most satisfactory account of the Turkish government, I mean Mr. Thornton, that the Ulema, or ministers of the Mahometan law, at whose head is the Mufti, do not assume or exercise a power paramount to that of the Sultan, however they may have been resorted to, in order to sanction the imperial edicts, or to join with the Janissaries, or general voice of the people, in deposing a cruel or incapable prince.* The Mufti, who has been likened to the Popes or patriarchs of the Christian sects, but is in fact more similar to the Pontifex Maximus of ancient Rome, is in dignity, though not in power, the second person in the empire; but he is not, as some have endeavoured to prove, the first. To show this, it is sufficient to say that his continuance in office depends upon the will of the Sultan.

---

* Essay on Public Credit, 1710, (reprinted 1797,) p. 17.

† Liv. xxv. chapit. 15, de l'Esprit des Loix.

‡ The Koran, Surat 2, verse 59, has these words: "*Verily, those who believe, both Jews and Nazarenes (Christians,) and Zalians, (Gentiles in Arabia, or Ishmaelites,) whosoever of these believe in God and the last day, and do good works, have their reward with their Lord, and no fear shall come upon them, neither shall they be affected with sorrow.*" Artus Thomas, in his Triumph of the Cross; Bellarmine in his Controversies, vol. 2. p. 293, 294; and Thomas a Jesu, on the Controversies of the Gentiles, p. 677, and others cry scandal against this toleration, the last dotage of Mahomet; and Reland has, I fear, with some success, defended the prophet against the heinous charge. A Short System of Mahometan Theology, book 2. sect. 2.—The Cham of the Tartars told Rubruquis, in 1253, "*Que comme Dieu avoit donne aux mains plusieurs doigts, ainsi avoit il ordonne aux hommes plusieurs chemins pour aller en Paradis.*" Voyage en Tartarie, cap. xlvi. p. 119.

* Present State of Turkey, p. 100 to p. 113.

In a despotic monarchy nothing remains fixed but the religion;[*] the Mahometan law is unchangeable and all powerful; but its immediate ministers possess neither the one nor the other attribute. If the *fetwa,* or decree, of the Mufti were a necessary sanction to every act of importance, which it seems not to be, the person who disposes of the office may be supposed capable of controuling the officer. The religion may be called superior to the Sultan, for by it he holds his power, but I cannot think that any opposition to the imperial authority on the part of the Ulema, however long or successfully it may continue, can be adduced to shew that the Sultan of the Turks is not a despotic prince, or can be considered in any other light than an insurrection, to which every absolute monarch must occasionally be subject.

It is the custom for the Grand Signior to back his ordinances relative to peace and war, and other state matters, by the *fetwa*, as it is for him to go to the mosck publicly on every Friday, and to attend in person at a conflagration; but the two latter obligations are equally strong with the former; nor are the three exceptions to the exercise of his own will and discretion of sufficient importance to be mentioned as a proof of limitation in the Ottoman sovereignty, or of any other point, than that no prince is altogether superior to established usages. Nevertheless, Abu-Taleb, the traveller, commonly going by the name of the Persian prince, a much better judge than either De Tott, Sir James Porter, or other Europeans who have adopted the same notion, informs us in his Travels, that he did not consider the power of the Grand Signior absolute, which I can only account for by supposing that in the Asiatic governments to which he had been accustomed, insurrections were not so frequent, nor the influence of usage so apparent, as in the capital of Turkey.

The identity of law and religion gives a sanctity of character to the Mufti, the Cazy-askers of Roumelia and Natolia, the Istamboul-Effendi, the Mollahs, Cadis, Naibs, and all the administrators of justice in Turkey; but the ecclesiastics, or Murtaziki, are, except in their education, a distinct body from the Ulema, and are not immediately dependent upon the Mufti, but upon the Kislar Aga, or chief of the Black Eunuchs.[*]

---

[*] De l'Esprit des Loix.

[*] The Cazy-askers are chief justices; they sit not on the right, as Mr. Thornton says, but on the left hand, of the grand vizier in the divan. The Istambel-Effendi is chief justice of Constantinople; the Mollahs or Moulas are presidents of great towns, to whom the ancient Ottoman kings paid 500 aspers a day, but who now receive nothing from the government (Bobovius, a Treatise concerning the Turkish Liturgy, sect. 2), the Cadis are judges of small towns, and the Naibs puisne judges. Each court has a Katib, a secretary, a Mokaiyd, a clerk, and Muhzir, a crier. The Mufti's pension is

The Santons, Alfaquis and Shieks explain texts of the Koran; but their sermons are not given at any stated time, nor very frequently; the Talismans perform the same office, but are chiefly employed in transcribing the holy books; the Imaums recite the prayers, at stated hours of the day, in the moscks, but not aloud, only animating the people by their example: on Friday, however, before prayers at noon, a reader or chanter (Nat'chon) sings the praises of Mahomet. To each mosck there is also a Haim, or overseer; Fernesh, a sweeper, and Abkesh, a water-drawer. One Muezzin, or chanter, will serve for several moscks. The burying-grounds are under the inspection of a Turba-dhar, or sexton. There is also a person whose business it is to attend to the innumerable lights with which the larger moscks are supplied, and to provide for the illuminations of the Rhamazan, when all the minarets are adorned with lamps, hanging not only round the galleries and to the tops of the spires, but upon strings from one turret to another, so as to form various figures and verses from the Koran.

There is no part of the religious duties of a Mussulman which requires the intervention of a priest; nor, although a reader and chanter are retained in some great families, is the distinction which separates the Christian laity and clergy, to be recognized amongst the Mahometans. There is nothing in the external behaviour of the Imaums or others of the secular priesthood, which distinguishes them from their fellow-subjects: they assume no authority, either temporal or ecclesiastical; and are under the controul of the Cadis, or municipal judges: in short, they are the guardians of the moscks rather than of the Mussulmans. The Hogias, or school-masters, (one of whom is attached to each of the great moscks in Constantinople,) are, in smaller parishes, the only public readers of the Koran.

The extreme simplicity of this religion and of the ordinances by which it is supported, has not, however, prevented all pretensions to extraordinary holiness, or the encouragement of several sects of fanatical impostors, to whom some allusion has before been made. The Christian recluses were the admiration of the Mussulmans before they had adopted the same practice; but since the first institution of religious orders, in the reign and by the patronage of Nasser-ben-Hamed, the third prince of the Samanide dynasty, in the year 331 of the Hegira, there has been a constant succession of saints, distinguished from their fellow citizens by the title and profession of poverty, and supposed to be occupied in the perpetual contemplation of the more abstruse points of the Mahometan doctrine.* These saints have been known under the names

---

five hundred zequins a day from the Seraglio. (Notice sur la Cour du Grand Seigneur, p. 141.)

* D'Herbelot, Bibliotheque Orientale, Articles, *Nasser Ben-Hamed, Dervische, Sofi, Zaked, Faker*, &c. Sâadi, in the Ghulistan, relates, that the Christian monks of Mount Libanus in his time performed miracles; and Bokhari, in his book entitled Sahib, recounts the wonders of the Abyssinian, Sahib Gioraije, a Christian solitary, with the good faith of a Capuchin. There is also an Arabic history of Christian monks.

of Calenders, Torlaquis, and other distinct appellations applied to particular sects, but are more generally spoken of under their original title of Dervish, a word having the same signification in the Turkish and Persian language as the Fakir of the Arabic, and denoting a poor man. They have their travelling mendicants, fraternities of settled recluses, and some few solitaries, amounting in all to thirty-two orders; all of which differ from each other, and are distinguished also by particular manners and appearance from the rest of the world.

Although it is expressly said in the Koran, that the vow of celibacy is not received in paradise, the Calenders do not admit of marriage, but the generality of the orders are under no such restriction. Some individuals amongst them have, like Haji Bek-Tash, attained an extraordinary reputation; but the profession of piety, beyond the acquirement of alms, is not attended with any advantages in Turkey. The Mussulmans consider themselves obliged to contribute to the support of the religious; at the same time that not only the more enlightened of them, but the common people regard the Dervishes with but little internal reverence, and rather tolerate than approve of their institutions. The Seyeh, or wanderers, who raise contributions by proclamation, are relieved but not respected.* Their *kirkah*, or torn habit, notwithstanding its alleged descent from the ancient prophets, has been the subject of much sarcasm for the Oriental wits, and the vices which it is known to envelope, have not added to its respectability."* — A Dervish attempted to kill Sultan Mahomet the Second, and also Achmet the First; and in the reign of Osman the First another enthusiast ventured to disturb the peace of the empire, by foretelling the triumph of Christianity, upon the strength of a vision seen at Mecca. The prophet was cudgelled to death.†

---

* On coming into a town, a Seyeh cries aloud from the market place or court of the mosck, "*Ya allah senden besh bin altun isterim*"—*O God, give me, I pray, five thousand crowns*—or some other sum or commodity, which he is to collect in the course of his journey. The *Seyehs* come even from India. One of them delivered to Kioprili Mustapha Pasha, Grand Vizier to Solyman the Second, letters from the Great Mogul, and told him that his master, hearing of the Sultan's distresses, had sent an offer of assistance to his brother Mussulman. To which Kioprili replied, "that Solyman would be ever grateful for the zeal and friendship of the great Padisha of India, but that his affairs just then being in a prosperous state, he could be honoured with no greater favour from his Indian Majesty, than his commanding his beggars not to enter the Ottoman dominions."—Cantemir, Ottoman Hist. Part I. book i. p. 40, of Tindal's translation.

* Sâadi, in the eighth chapter of his Ghulistan, addressing the religious, says, "*Possess the virtues of a true Dervish, and then, instead of a woollen cap, wear, if you will, a Tartar bonnet.*" Ebu-Cassab, one of their spiritual masters, calls their garments the mask of hypocrisy; and Hafiz prefers a goblet of wine to the blue mantle of the Dervish; which the Persians, who have given a mystical meaning to all the verses of this poet, explain as an attachment to divine love, and a hatred of hypocrisy. *Dervishlik khirkhaden bellu doghil*, is a Turkish proverb, which answers to the *Cucullus non facit monachum*. See D'Herbelot, Bibliotheque Orientale, Article Dervische.

† In the early ages of the Mahometan religion, a Mohemetan said that he

The character of the mendicant Dervishes of Asia Minor has been already seen.‡ Yet the Santons and Sheiks, whose exhortations make most impression in the moscks, are the superiors of these fanatics; and a sermon preached by one of the former in St. Sophia, was the origin of the disgraceful expedition, undertaken by Sultan Solyman against Malta, in the year 1564.‡

Attempts have been made to abolish the institution, but the Janissaries still retain eight Dervishes of the order of Bek-Tash, as chaplains to the army; and the people of Constantinople run in crowds to amuse themselves (for no other motive can be assigned to them) at the exhibitions of the turning and of the howling Dervishes, to which all strangers are carried, as to the theatre or other places of entertainment in the cities of Christendom.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Versions of the 59th Psalm.

SIR, *Aug.* 4, 1812.

Looking lately into a Review of a version of the Psalms in your last volume, [V. vii. p. 319] I recollected a comparison, with which I once amused myself, of three different versions, of the 59th Psalm, composed at very different periods: That Psalm contains, in verses 6, 7, 14 and 15, some expressions, the sense of which it is rather difficult to convey in translated verse and yet escape ludicrous associations. You will, I think, agree with me that Merrick has eminently succeeded, especially when compared with his forerunners.

Sternhold and Hopkins, about 1550, thus render the verses:

At night they run and seek about,
Like dogs they howl also,
And all the city quite throughout,
From place to place they go.

They speak of me with mouth alway,
But in their lips are swords:
They have contriv'd my death, and say
There's none doth hear our words.

At evening they return apace,
As dogs they grin and cry:
Throughout the streets in every place,
They run about and spy.

They seek about for meat alway,
But let them not be fed:
Nor find a house wherein they may
Be bold to put their head.

The Psalms of David in Meeter, 18*mo.*

The second specimen is from Manton, Owen, Poole, Calamy and others, in 1673, recommended by the signatures of Nonconformist ministers of that time, who thus close a prefatory Address to the reader. "Divine composures should be represented to us in a fit translation, least we want *David* in *David*: while his holy extasies are delivered in a

---

was God. A man reminded him, that one who had called himself a prophet had been killed. "*They were right,*" said the other, "*for I did not give him his commission: he was no prophet of mine.*"—Paroles Remarquables des Orientaux, Galand.

‡ Letter XXXVI. p. 648, of this volume. (*Hobhouse.*)

* Notice sur la Cour du Grand Seigneur, p. 148.

flat and bald expression. The translation which is now put into thy hands cometh nearest to the original of any that we have seen, and runneth with such a fluent sweetness, that we thought fit to recommend it to thy Christian acceptance; some of us having used it already with great comfort and satisfaction." The passage is thus rendered in this translation:

At evening they go to and fro;
They make great noise and sound
Like to a dog, and often walk
About the city round.

Behold they belch out with their mouth
And in their lips are swords:
For they do say thus, who is he
That now doth hear our words?

At evening let thou them return
Making great noise and sound
Like to a dog, and often walk
About the city round.

And let them wander up and down
In seeking food to eat;
And let them grudge when they shall not
Be satified with meat.

This version of 1673, was exactly contemporary with the infancy of Watts, and enhances his merit as a versifier by shewing how scanty were the means afforded him to form a taste in English Psalmody.

We shall now be relieved from these examples of *made English*, and gratified by the following version of Merrick:

When eve's dark shades o'er heav'n are hung,
See! as the dog with fury stung,
While hideous yells their wrath betray,
From street to street they urge their way.
Swords in their lips, without a fear
Their threats they vent: for who shall hear?

When eve's dark shades o'er heav'n are ung,
Still, as the dog with fury stung,
Still let them, clam'ring for their prey,
From street to street pursue their way,
Insatiate; while their destin'd spoil
Elusive mocks their fruitless toil.

The third *translation*, alone worthy of the name, appears to retain every sentiment contained in the passages versified, and yet to avoid expressions mean or ludicrous. The 59th Psalm is one which, for obvious reasons, Watts has omitted, being quite impracticable for his purpose of applying the "Psalms of David—to the *Christian* state and worship."

N. L. T.

Retarder of the Abolition of the Slave Trade.

Sir,

In your Sixth Volume, (p. 449.) I communicated some additions to Mr. Clarkson's List of Forerunners in the Abolition of the Slave Trade. I have since met with an eminent *Retarder* of that and other benevolent projects. This was Carteret, Lord Granville, of whose opinions Dr. Kippis gives the following account in the *Addenda* to Biog. Britt. Vol. 3rd. from Lord Egmont's manuscripts.

"He maintained that Christianity is incorporated with civil government, as sand with lime, each of which by itself makes no mortar. Where he imagined that the public interest might receive prejudice by Christianity, he was against its being taught. He hoped, therefore, never to see our negroes in America become Christians, because he believed that this would render them less laborious slaves. On the same principle, he was against any attempts to convert the American savages. In learning Christianity, they would fall into the use of letters, and a skill in the arts being the consequence, they would become more formidable to the plantations. Pursuing a similar train of reasoning, Lord Granville wished to God that the Pope might never turn Protestant, or the Italians cease to be Papists, for then we should sell them no fish. He was glad that the clergy sent abroad to our plantations were ignorant and immoral wretches, because they could have no influence over the inhabitants as better and wiser men would have; and who would use that influence for the purpose of inspiring the planters with a spirit of independence on their mother country. He was hostile to the scheme of sending bishops to America. These, he thought, would labour to bring the several sects to one religion; whereas the security of that people's dependence on England he conceived to arise from their mutual divisions. He was, an enemy, likewise, to the improvement of our colonies in learning. This, he said, would take off their youth from wholly attending to trade, fill them with speculative notions of government and liberty, and prevent the education of the sons of rich planters in England, where they contract a love to this kingdom, and when grown old, come back and settle, to the great increase of our wealth. Even at home he was against charity-schools, and was not for having the vulgar taught to read, that they might think of nothing but the plough and their other low avocations."

This nobleman, who would thus have withheld "the key of knowledge" from the people, was an accomplished scholar and a "distinguished orator and statesman." He died in 1763, aged 73. Half a century has effected such a salutary change in public opinion, that it would be now scarcely possible to find a nobleman who "was not for having the vulgar taught to read."

VERAX.

Mr. Maurice on a Passage in the Obituary of Mr. Jones.

Clifton, near Bristol.

Sir,

In the Memoir you have published in your last number, p. 551—554 of Mr. J. Jones, my name mentioned in a manner which compels me to address you, least I should seem to be satisfied with praise to which I am not entitled. The following gentlemen employed me as the agent of their kindness to Mr. Jones: The Rev. T. Morgan, S. Boddington, Esq. London, —— Strutt, Esq. Belper, Dr. Disney, Dr. Toulmin, Mr. Thomas Hurry, Yarmouth, and my much lamented and ever-to-be-revered friend, Mr. Simpson, of Bath. But there is another gentleman to whom the highest tribute of gratitude is due,—a gentleman to whom Mr. Jones was entirely unknown when he came to Clifton, but whose medical skill and constant services were gratuitously employed during all the time Mr. Jones resided here. Mr. King would never have wished this circumstance to have been stated in the memoir, but the knowledge of the fact obliges me to bestow praise where it is justly due. The kindness of Mr. King was a subject on which Mr. Jones used to enlarge with peculiar pleasure; I trust, therefore, I shall be pardoned for giving publicity to the gratitude he was ever anxious to manifest to those who rendered him any service. Your insertion of this letter in your next number will oblige

Yours, &c.
MICHAEL MAURICE.

On Future Punishment.

Sir,

A question of high importance has long been agitated by Christians, particularly by that class who are I believe the general readers of the Repository. It is of no less importance than the future destiny of the human dead. And as I fear very erroneous and unscriptural notions are entertained by the great bulk of Christians, and doubt and perplexity by some others, if you will allow me to occupy a page or two of your valuable Miscellany, I will examine the subject, and endeavour to shew what appears to me the true meaning of the scriptures. But it will probably be discussed to most advantage by laying down one or two preliminary observations. First, That as it is a doctrine of revelation contained in the Christian scriptures alone, we must refer to them, and them only, for all authority in support of any opinion we undertake to defend.

Second, Although it is readily allowed, that all figurative texts may be fairly interpreted in doubtful cases by such as are acknowledged to be plain, it cannot be admitted, that texts not figurative shall be made so, and referred for explanation not to plain texts of scripture, but to inferences and deductions said to be drawn from thence.

On the subject of the future destiny of man, there is one point, and one only, on which all seem willing to agree, which is that the reward of the righteous will be immortality and everlasting happiness: here we are all satisfied with the plain language of scripture, and it is only when applied to punishment that some are so anxious to explain it away as figurative.

On the punishment of the wicked there seem to prevail three opinions: the 1st, that the wicked will be punished with endless torments. The 2nd, that their punishment will be only temporary and remedial, and that finally they will be restored to endless happiness. The 3rd, that the wicked will be utterly destroyed by the second death, and that therefore their punishment will be everlasting.*

Let us now enquire into the evidence adduced in support of these several opinions; for so much do they differ from each other, that but one of them can be true.

If the voice of majorities is to determine the question, the first must be the true opinion: but here let it be observed, that neither numbers nor antiquity can avail any thing, unless it can be proved to be the plain and positive declaration of the Christian Scriptures; for a doctrine so shocking in itself, and so blasphemous against the divine character and perfections, should not be admitted on any evidence short of direct and miraculous communication from God. But however men may have deceived themselves, I must be permitted to doubt, whether any rational creature ever did seriously believe, at the same time, in the infinite benevolence of the Deity and in the endless torments of sinners. The fact is, that men have thought little about it in the point of view in which it is here placed; and when it is recollected how many ages it has been made one of the prime articles of the orthodox creed, and the source of so lucrative a trade to the apostate church, for which their purgatory was introduced into the drama, is it to be wondered at that without enquiry, when men have taken it for granted, and parents have taught their children and perpetuated the belief, that the wicked would be burnt everlastingly in hell fire, with the devil and his angels, that it should have become the popular creed? This is all the foundation on which it is built; for I shall hereafter shew it is no doctrine of the New Testament.

---

* Whenever the words everlasting and eternal are used in this letter, they are intended to mean endless.

As it is to be hoped in this enlightened period there is no rational Christian who believes in this doctrine, it will not be necessary here to enlarge upon it; as my business chiefly lies with the second class of Christians who are generally called Universalists, who avow their belief that the punishment of the wicked will be long and severe, but remedial and corrective, and that when they have been sufficiently punished for their crimes here, they will be admitted to the enjoyment of everlasting happiness. In support of this opinion I have sought in vain for any scriptural evidence. I have a small tract* on this subject now lying before me, written by a most excellent man, who has evinced the zeal and labours of an apostle; and as he has given a summary of all the material arguments in support of this doctrine, I shall for the sake of brevity cite from it such passages as seem suited to my purpose. "Those (says he) who contend that future punishment will be corrective, don't pretend to a knowledge of its limits; they suppose the subject involved in such awful obscurity, that the impenitent sinner has every thing to fear; and in contending that it will be corrective, they mean that it will produce the moral improvement of the punished." To these suppositions I have nothing to say; they are supported by no evidence, they are suppositions only!

Again—"It is not now contended (says he) that the final restitution of all mankind is so clearly revealed in the Scriptures, as to be capable of being supported otherwise than by inference and deduction, nor that it ought to be maintained as a leading or fundamental doctrine of Christianity; it is presumed to be a fair deduction from the character and known perfections of God, and from various declarations in the sacred writings; and that it is capable of being supported by just reasoning and fair inference, and on this ground its advocates are willing to rest it." And if this be its best ground, like all other structures without a foundation, it must, I suspect, fall.

If the scriptures had not contained positive declarations of the punishment of sinners, these suppositions, inferences and deductions, would have done as well as any others, and would have been entitled to attention, but as they do clearly contain such, these can weigh nothing in the argument. But the advocates of this doctrine come forward in a concluding paragraph, and boldly avow—"That it is of no consequence to their leading arguments in how literal a sense the words perish, perdition, destruction, death, are applied to future punishment." This is taking a most unwarrantable licence with the sacred writings; for if the plainest language may be deemed figurative, and figurative language plain, it is making them a complete nose of wax, that may be moulded into any form that best pleases the fancy of the artist; rendering them so vague and uncertain that they may be made to prove or disprove any thing; thereby producing complete confusion and the most alarming consequences. To apply arguments, by evidence from the New Testament, against the advocates of this doctrine is useless; for they have conceded the point that their hypothesis is incapable of being supported from it except by inference and deduction: finding their weakness here they seem to take their strong ground in the character and perfections of the Deity, and in further support of this they add a popular and imposing argument, that even the omniscience of God is scarcely able to draw the line of distinction between the best of the wicked and the worst of the good. So imperceptible are the shades, that to punish the one with the loss of life, and give the other immortality and happiness would be injustice!

---

* Wright on Future Punishment.

But here the advocates of this doctrine do not appear better fortified than by revelation; for unless they can prove that the scripture doctrine contended for by their opponents, is inconsistent with the divine perfections, is it not a most unwarrantable presumption to arraign the wisdom of God in the plan of his divine government, and to suppose they can frame one more consistent with his benevolence? Contemplating the plan of providence in the works of nature, we plainly perceive, through the whole, a gradation of privilege; whether we examine the vegetable, the animal or the intellectual creation, life is appointed to each individual for different periods, from one moment to one hundred years and upwards, according to its species; this is seen in the acorn, from that which falls from the oak and is devoured by the animal waiting beneath it, to that which is sown and produces the full grown tree, which becomes the ornament of the forest, remaining for centuries to the utmost period of its appointed duration; we see it in our own species, from the infant that dies in the birth, to the man that lives fourscore years and upwards. The appointment of these different periods of life may be justly entitled privileges; but as it is manifest that the benevolent author of nature has afforded to each individual a large preponderance of enjoyment during his existence, whether it be short or long, shall we, weak and ignorant as we are, presume to arraign either the wisdom or justice of the plan of his divine government? In the promise of reward to the righteous, the scriptures every where annex it to character: this life is said to be our state of probation, (and with Paley I believe this is our wisest view of it) and during its progress it is our duty to form our character from the example and precepts of our great Master; the precept of our Lord, which he tells us is the first and great commandment, is "that we love the Lord our God with all our heart, our mind and strength," that is, that we should feel such a high reverence for God, as the Creator, Governor, Preserver and Disposer of all things, in whom we live and move and have our being, as to fix on our minds his constant presence and agency, in all the events of life, so as to refer every thing to him—which is living in habitual devotion—seeing God in every thing and seeing every thing in God. This as I understand the precept is forming the Christian character to which the reward is promised, and because such characters alone are fitted for that state which is prepared and promised to the righteous. Now between such a character as this, and the best of the wicked, who have not God in all their thoughts, instead of nice shades of difference, there seems a broad distinction; but let it be remembered, that whilst the divine Being has given life and immortality to the one, he has afforded to the other a large balance of enjoyment during his life, and therefore has been guilty of no injustice to any. The reason of this diversity of privilege in the divine plan we may know hereafter, but cannot know now; it is hid in the same obscurity as the introduction of all other apparent evil, but we can discover enough to rest satisfied that God is infinitely powerful, wise and good.

The advocates for the third opinion contend, that they have embraced it upon what appears to them the plain language of the New Testament, which is, that the righteous will go into life everlasting, and the wicked into everlasting punishment. What this punishment will be, the scriptures have explained in such a variety of passages through the whole of the New Testament, that it may be justly questioned, whether there be any truth more clearly or repeatedly declared, or more forcibly inculcated, than that the punishment of the wicked will be loss of life, death, utter perdition, everlasting destruction, the second death. This, when contrasted with immortality and everlasting life, seems as plain and strong as language can possibly make it.

Whilst we live in obedience to the plain precepts of the gospel, which are, supreme love to God, and an affectionate regard to the welfare and happiness of all our fellow-creatures, we shall certainly receive the promised reward, and this speculative difference of opinion will be of little consequence to us. But as far as my observation goes, the belief of universal restoration has a practical tendency to lessen the restraints to vice, and to slacken our endeavours and watchfulness to guard against habitual trespasses, and from its popularity is I fear an encreasing evil. It is this view of the subject which has induced me to offer these sentiments to my fellow-Christians, through the means of your valuable Mis-

cellany, and if it be the means of correcting one erroneous opinion, I shall rejoice as not having laboured in vain. Let us not then flatter and deceive ourselves with a vain philosophy, for the Christian scriptures have plainly declared, and it is a solemn and awful declaration! that the wages of sin is DEATH, ETERNAL DEATH; but the gift of God is ETERNAL LIFE, promised to the righteous through Jesus Christ our Lord.
J. S.

Society for Conversion of the Jews.

SIR,

In a report lately published by the London Society for the Conversion of the Jews, we have various extracts from letters received from Germany, to which they appear to give undoubting credit; and from one of these I copy the following, which they call an "*authentic fact.*"

"About ten years ago a particular party arose among the Jews in Poland, which has also many followers in some parts of Germany, and chiefly in Bohemia, and they even asserted that a branch of their association was already in Palestine. I have made acquaintance with a leader of this party, who *believed in Jesus* as the *Saviour of the world*, and sincerely reverenced him."

Now, Mr. Editor, though the writer of this account seems entirely unmindful of the inference which naturally arises from it,—can we call these men who acknowledge Jesus as the *Saviour of the world* other, or less than *Christians?* though held perhaps in his opinion as undeserving of that name, because they do not add many other mysterious and complicated articles, to the simple profession of their faith.

Some of your readers have doubtless noticed this account, who are able to form more probable conjectures than myself, with respect to the hopes for the speedy conversion of the Jews to rational Christianity which may be founded upon it.

I remain, Sir,
Your obliged humble servant,
M. H.

Quaker Doctrine of the Trinity.

SIR,

The intent of my last communication (p. 373—376) was to remove the erroneous impression A. B's. defective statement (p. 307) of the belief of the early Quakers was calculated to make on such of your readers as were not better informed. The object of this is to lay before them a brief, but plain and comprehensive "Confession of Faith," which was drawn up and "presented to the parliament" in the year 1693, on behalf of the Society of Friends for the express purpose of clearing them from the imputation of having imbibed "some Socinian notions." What these notions were I cannot precisely determine, but it is obvious enough from this document, that the real sentiments of its authors were not incompatible with the pure doctrine of Unitarianism, that there is only one living and true God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; for otherwise this confession of faith which was signed by above thirty members of the Society, of whom George Whitehead, an eminent minister among them, was one, is nothing to the purpose for which it was presented to the legislature.

The charges this confession was intended to repel related to the person of Christ, and especially to what has been called his miraculous conception. Of these, if the principal accusation was, that they rejected this tenet, their confession of faith must have shewn it to be groundless, for in common with many learned and unlearned Unitarians before and since that time, they believed the narratives in the introduction to Matthew's and Luke's gospels to be authentic parts of the evangelical history. But how far, they deemed this tenet an indispensable article of Christian faith, or what degree of importance they attached to it, does not I believe appear either in this confession, or elsewhere in their writings. Without questioning the authenticity or truth of the narratives they seem, supposing these to be genuine, to have generally followed the wise example of the apostles and of the sacred writers, none of whom again mention or allude to the subject, much less have they insisted upon its importance or connected it with any article of faith.

This silence is very natural, supposing the fact to be true, and the narratives of it authentic, if the sacred writers deemed it unimportant; as it is also, if those narratives are spurious. But incessantly as those writers inculcate the reception of such facts and doctrines, as they considered necessary to be believed by Christian converts, their uniform silence on this subject is not I think to be otherwise satisfactorily accounted for. That all the existing *M. SS.* contain these narratives is admitted, and it is in my mind not very material whether they are supposed to be authentic, or not, provided no greater stress is laid on them, as containing an article of Christian faith, than Jesus Christ and his apostles have enjoined. To insist upon more than this, as essential, is unwise, if not unchristian. It is to encumber the faith of the gospel with an unnecessary article, whether true, or not, and palpably to obstruct its reception amongst men. To represent the verity and credibility of Christianity, as standing upon no better evidence than such a fact as this, is to expose it, I will not say to insuperable difficulties, but to objections of serious import, to many upright and considerate minds, and to such objections as cannot be urged with any effect against its fundamental doctrines, as taught by Jesus Christ, and confirmed by the testimony of his apostles.

The following confession of faith is strictly and properly Unitarian. Many persons who have zealously and ably maintained that doctrine, would I believe object to no part of it; and with a slight exception or two I suppose it would be conformable to the belief of most Unitarian Christians. On the other hand, I am persuaded no real Trinitarian could possibly esteem it a satisfactory exposition of his faith. Sewel gives it verbatim as follows, but without the address to either of the houses of parliament. It was probably presented to both. The reader will notice how expressly it purports to have been written in the name and on behalf of the Society of Friends, although the address and signature are not given. Its authors say,—

"Be it known to all, that we sincerely believe and confess, I. That Jesus

> of *Nazareth*, who was born of the Virgin *Mary*, is the true *Messiah*, the very Christ, the son of the living God, to whom all the prophets gave witness: And that we do highly value his death, sufferings, works, offices, and merits for the redemption of mankind, together with his laws, doctrine and ministry. II. That this very Christ of God, who is the Lamb of God, that takes away the sins of the world, was slain, was dead, and is alive, and lives for ever in his divine eternal glory, dominion and power with the Father. III. That the holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, are of divine authority, as being given by inspiration of God. IV. And that magistracy, or civil government, is *God's* ordinance, the good ends thereof being for the punishment of evil doers, and praise of them that do well." *Sewel's History of the Quakers*. p. 649.

"By this and the like writings," adds Sewel, "the eyes of many that were at the helm [of government] began to be more opened; and even among the bishops were some that inclined to moderation; for the king endeavoured as much as he could to promote the most moderate among the Churchmen to those high dignities; and prejudice, which had blinded many in respect to the Quakers, began to abate more and more."[*]

When the reigning monarch manifested such a noble spirit in the selection of bishops and ministers of state, it is no wonder that some of the former were inclined to moderation. Fettered as the king was in some measure by the intolerant spirit of the times, he bestowed honours and dignities, wealth and power, "as much as he could," on "the most moderate" and deserving. No persecuting bigot, known to be such, could look for promotion at his hands, and thus did he even incline high Churchmen to toleration. This was wise, just, politic, and worthy of the king of a free people, the father of the glorious revolution.

It was surely more to these causes than to the efficacy of such writings as the above, that the eyes of ministers and bishops were opened to their true interest, and that they saw with increasing clearness, the advantages of justice and toleration. Had the king been disposed to countenance and reward an intolerant zeal against those who could not for conscience' sake receive the dogmas of the church as gospel truths, they would soon have discovered that the above confession of faith afforded no evidence whatever that the persons who drew it up were free from "Socinian notions," but much presumptive evidence to the contrary. For what is its amount? Is there any recognition in it of the doctrine of three co-eternal and co-equal persons in the unity of essence? Nothing of the kind. Without saying how far it agrees, or wherein it differs, I will enable your readers to compare it with the opinions of Socinus on the most important points to which it relates.

> "It is my judgment that Christ was a man, Rom. v. 15. conceived and

---

[*] It should have been said in p. 376, that George Keith was *soon afterwards* ordained, instead of saying he "had recently been ordained." An erroneous date in the margin of the page in Sewel's history, where the circumstance is mentioned, led me into the mistake. He was ordained by the Bishop of London, and Burnet, with whom Keith was a fellow student at Aberdeen, says he "was reconciled to the church, and is *now* [in the year 1700] in holy orders among us." History of his own times, Vol. ii. p. 144. The Bishop says "reconciled," but Keith never was before in communion with the Church of England. In the early part of his life, and till he joined the Quakers, he was of the Kirk of Scotland.

formed in the womb of the Virgin, without the intervention of a man, by the power of the divine spirit. Matt. i. 20. 23. Luke i. 35. and that being thus born, he was at first capable of suffering and mortal, 2 Cor. xiii. 4. till having discharged here on earth the duty assigned him by God, he afterwards ascended into heaven, and became immortal, and no longer liable to sufferings. Rom vi. 9. The divine sonship of Christ can be referred to his nature only so far as it relates to this, that Christ was formed in the womb of the Virgin without the instrumentality of a man, by the divine power. For the angel foretold to the Virgin of whom he was born, that on this account he should be called the Son of God, Luke i. 35. and of consequence his own and only begotten Son; as no other person ever was the Son of God in the same way, by the immediate origin of his being.

"But Jesus is thus styled, *principally* because he is the person whom his name indicates him to be, namely Christ. Jesus is a name applicable to him merely as a man; but Christ is the name that points out the great eminence and excellence of character conferred on him by God; for the word God is every where to be understood after it, as if it had been expressly written The Christ of God. This eminence arose from his being the King of God's people. Kings were appointed over his people, and anointed by a divine ordinance; therefore they were called the *anointed* of God, or his Christs, for this is the import of the word Christ. This name which was in some sense applicable to them, was applicable to Jesus in the most proper and absolute sense, and had a force when given to him, not belonging to it when bestowed on them. For Jesus was, in the highest, truest, and most peculiar sense, the King of God's people"

"As to the opinion commonly received, that Christ is the only begotten of God, because he and no one besides him was begotten of the divine substance, I regard it as a mere human invention, i.e. not by any means agreeable to the sacred Scriptures, which make no mention of any generation from the substance of God himself, and as entirely repugnant to sound reason, which abhors the thought of God's begetting from his own substance like corruptible animals, or that the individual and simple essence of God should be divided or multiplied, or, that remaining entire and numerically one, it should be common to many.

"To this let it be added, that the Scripture plainly explains the true and divine filiation of Christ, as we just now shewed, when we spoke of his conception in the womb of the Virgin; and expressly uses as synonimous the phrases "Jesus was the Christ," and "Jesus was the Son of God. Matt. xvi. 16. Mark viii. 29. Luke ix. 20. Matt. xxvi. 63. Mark xiv. 61. Luke xxii. 67. 69. John xx. 31. Hence it appears because Jesus was not the King of the people of God, and so the Christ in the highest and most absolute sense, till after he rose from the dead, that it was said he was constituted the Son of God by his resurrection from the dead, and was then begotten by God when God raised him from the dead.' Rom. i. 4. Acts xiii. 33. Soc. Opera. tom. i. p. 654. Or, Memoirs of the Life, &c. of F. Socinus, by Joshua Toulmin. P. 178—181.

For the sake of brevity, I wave giving your readers the just ideas of this celebrated author respecting the scriptural designation of Christ as *the Lamb of* God; but I would recommend A. B. to consider them seriously, and carefully to compare his sentiments as above given, with the foregoing confession of faith. If A.B. should favour your readers with such a comparison, I hope he will not travel out of the record, or give us any Trinitarian notions he may happen to have adopted, instead of the doctrines of the early Quakers. But if he can, let him shew in what particulars the above, or any other equally well-authenticated profession of primitive Quakerism, approaches nearer to the recognized doctrine of the Trinity than the extracts I have adduced from the writings of a man, who in the estimation of William Penn, had "*in many things*," respecting the Christian doctrine, "*a clearer prospect than most of his contemporaries.*" Fully concurring in this opinion, yet resolved to call no man master upon earth, with regard to matters of faith, I am sincerely your's,

PHILEMON.

Mr. Wright to Mr. Jennings on Free Communion.

Wisbeach, Oct.5, 1813.

SIR,

We happily live in an age when Christians can differ in opinion without censuring and condemning each other, when they can oppose each other's views and sentiments without any interruption of friendship and brotherly love. The unreserved avowal of what each person thinks right, and its being opposed with equal freedom and firmness by those who think differently, cannot fail to promote the knowledge of truth : so far as he who asserts, and he who contradicts, proceed with candour and Christian charity moral improvement must be advanced. Hence I argue, that in a Christian church, where free communion is admitted, Christian knowledge and moral improvement will be more rapidly promoted than in a society where uniformity of opinion and religious practice is rigidly maintained. From a knowledge of my views respecting free communion, *Mr. Strephon* proposed a question for my solution, (p. 31.) which supposed a case not likely to occur in any dissenting congregation. To this question I replied, (p. 252) with that caution which the difficulty involved in the supposed case appeared to make necessary, yet with that freedom which every lover of truth ought to exercise. On my reply to Mr. Strephon you have made some remarks (p. 591); to your remarks I now answer.

In the first place, permit me to say, you have not attempted to remove the principal ground of my reasoning and conclusions: viz. that, at the Lord's supper, *the table is the Lord's*, that Jesus is the only master, and has not delegated his authority to us. This you surely must grant; but if you grant it, how can you deny the conclusion, that no Christian, nor society of Christians, has a right to exercise authority over *that* table, or dominion over those who would come to it, to say who shall and who shall not be guests at it? Do not those who assume such authority invade the prerogative of their great Master, by exercising dominion at his table as if it was their own? Such persons ought to shew who gave them such authority, what warrant they have for the exercise of it. who made them more than guests at the Master's table, who appointed them to choose or refuse others who offer to be guests. I solicit your attention to these things as they materially affect the whole question about free communion.

Instead of answering my questions, "Have we a right to withdraw from the Lord's table because they [unbelievers] are there?" "If we esteem it a privilege should we neglect it because some may abuse it ?" You refer me to 2 Cor. vi. 14—16. In which passage Paul makes no mention of the Lord's supper, nor do his words appear to have any reference to it : he is exhorting Christians to keep themselves pure from heathen idolatry, and not to connect themselves by marriage, or in any other intimate way, with heathen idolaters, that they might avoid their pollutions: he is giving direction to them as individuals, not a rule of discipline respecting the Lord's table to be observed by them as a church. This passage therefore is not at all to your purpose. I suppose you will admit that Judas was an unworthy partaker of the Lord's supper, and that Jesus knew him to be such; yet he did not use his authority to prevent his partaking of it at its first institution, nor direct his other apostles not to partake of it with him.

Instead of shewing that we have a right, *authoritatively* to exclude any one from the Lord's table which is what you should have done, you merely object to my reference to the parable of the tares, and refer me to two other passages. I admit that the field mentioned in the parable is the world: for Jesus so explained it; and that the parable forbids every species of persecution: but is it not a species of persecution to exclude persons from any Christian privilege which they think themselves qualified to enjoy, merely because *you* think them improper persons to partake of such privilege? Surely you will admit that in Christian churches, however strait their communion, some tares will grow among the wheat; this appears to have been the case in the primitive churches: and so far the parable will be found applicable to churches, which are all planted in the field, the world. This will justify my reference to and application of it to the case in hand. Matt. xviii. 15—18, is not at all to your purpose, for our Lord does not in that passage give directions about excluding persons from the supper which was not then instituted; his disciples could not understand him to refer to an institution of which at the time they had not heard. The passage has no relation to matters of faith, it speaks solely of trespasses committed by one brother against another. Nor does Jesus in this place give rules to the church respecting its proceedings as a church; but simply to his disciples as individuals respecting the manner in which they should proceed in order to convince those who trespass against them of the impropriety of their conduct. Nothing is said in the passage of the relation in which the offender should be placed with respect to the church if he could not be convinced of his fault; but it is simply said "let him be unto *thee* [the injured person] as an heathen man and a publican." It is clear this passage can have nothing to do with the point in hand. In 1 Cor. Chap. v. the apostle is speaking of the case of the incestuous person, one who was notoriously immoral; of course the language he uses is not to be applied to a case essentially different, that of a person who is supposed to be sceptical, or erroneous in judgment, for a man may be such and not be a wicked person. Besides, Paul does not mention the Lord's supper any where in the chapter, nor say any thing about putting persons from the Lord's supper; but exhorts Christians not to associate with, to entertain at their tables, or be entertained by, professors of the gospel who were evidently immoral characters. It seems to me the passages you have quoted militate neither against the premises, nor the conclusions, in my former letter.

I think both unbelievers, and immoral persons, if they shew a disposition to frequent the Lord's table (and it is highly improbable the former ever will) may be deterred by faithful remonstrance, without any assumption of authority: should this fail in some rare case, it will not be an evil equal to invading the prerogative of Christ, and violating the law of liberty.

Respectfully yours,
R. WRIGHT.

Vindication of the Dialogue on the Scriptures in Reply to Mr. Sturch.

SIR,

I could ill spare time to write, nor could you conveniently insert, such an answer to Mr. Sturch's animadversions (p. 297—300) on my Dialogue, (p. 103—107) as I would willingly lay before the public. I trust however to your well-known liberality of sentiment, and love of fair investigation, for the insertion of the following comments on Mr. S—'s paper. And, in the first place, let me remark that in one instance at least Mr. S. has misconstrued my meaning; I think I might have said overlooked the more obvious interpretation, to introduce one better suited to his own purpose; that he has attached to a single, isolated passage, a sense, which, though as such, it may bear, yet as it relates to the general tenour of the whole, it cannot bear. When, for instance, he represents me as "coaxing" my supposed friend to place a blind implicit faith in the scriptures, he would, if he had read with more attention, or written with more impartiality, have said, that I was "coaxing" him to read and judge for himself; to discard all prejudices, as well those which oppose a belief in holy writ, as those which favour it. He would have said that I was urging this friend to make that very manful use of his understanding, which Mr. S. himself recommends; and he might, if he had chosen, have added, that I was doing all this, under a firm conviction that whoever enters upon the investigation of scripture truths fairly, patiently, and humbly, must become a firm believer in them.* To stir him up then to this investigation was my leading object in the appeal I made to a much-loved companion, and to effect this end, if it were possible, I represented to him the extreme folly of entering into with greater interest, and examining with greater zeal, subjects confessedly of a temporal nature than he had ever felt for those, of which the least that we can say is this, viz. that there is a preponderating evidence in favour of their having a strict relation to, and intimate connexion with, a future state. But if my friend resolutely persisted, (as in spite of all my representations he seemed disposed to do) in declining such examination, I was, I confess, desirous that he should hold to the safer side; that he should rather blindly believe, than blindly disbelieve; one of which two things all must do, who will not take the trouble of examining for themselves. I was desirous, I say, that my friend should rather blindly believe, than blindly disbelieve, and that for the following reason:

---

* Hume, if Dr. Percival may be relied on, is no instance to the contrary, for, says the Doctor, he, (Hume), confessed that he had never read the New Testament through. See *Percival's Evidences.*

That, supposing all systems of religion and morality (the scriptures included) to carry with them equal evidence of being true, then is it the part of wisdom to act in conformity with that, which threatens or promises the most, for it is that, from which we shall have most to suffer or enjoy, if it should prove true. The scriptures therefore, as of all known systems they promise the highest rewards to our obedience, and threaten the severest punishment to our disobedience, would, if they possessed only equal evidence with others, have a prevailing claim to the obedience of rational and provident creatures. But the truth is, that they possess much more evidence in their favour, than has ever belonged to any other moral or religious code received amongst men. I should rather say that they alone possess any evidence which deserves to be respected, or to be considered as establishing an authority of general force and universal application. For, adopting any other system of conduct, what assurance has any living man, that he is right, or safe? It will be answered, I am aware, the assurance of his reason; the conviction of his understanding. But if the assurance of his reason be a proof that he is right, then may two men holding diametrically opposite opinions in religion and morals, but each equally convinced of the propriety of those he has adopted, be both right at the same time. If conviction of being right, be a sure evidence that we are so, then may all the jarring speculative theorists in the world be right at the same time. Right reason must decide, says the disciple of philosophy. But what is right reason; where to be found; what the standard by which to try her? Rational enquiry, it is affirmed, brings us to the truth. I ask what evidence we can ever have that it has brought us there. Evidence which proves to our neighbour the very contrary of what it proves to us, should ever be distrusted. Now the scriptures have at least some evidence of affording a certain rule of right conduct, for they have some evidence (evidence which infidelity has never been able to overthrow, though she may be dissatisfied with it) that they come from God. What then is it the part of wisdom to do, in a case, where, amidst a host of uncertainties, one only system appears with any shew of paramount authority; any evidence of super-human origin; any shadow of proof that it is exclusively framed for general adoption, and universal obligation; any distinguishing test in its favour, which may not also (as reason has done) decide in favour of a hundred other systems, and give (as reason does) the same assurance of safety, to men professing the most opposite tenets? What, I say, is the part which wisdom should choose under circumstances such as these? Must she not adopt and act on the scripture ordinances, either till she can overthrow the evidence in favour of their divine origin, or else bring forward some other system with as strong, or stronger evidence in favour of its having such an origin? The human mind, does, it is true, as Mr. Sturch says, come from God, as also does the human body; but nobody will therefore say that the human body is perfect. The human mind, be it granted, is a spark, a very dim spark, of the eternal mind; but is it therefore to be regarded as affording a sure criterion of right; and this, notwithstanding that it has, at different times, formed and adopted, and is still continually forming and adopting, creeds as different from each other as light from dark?

Extol human reason never so much, it may still be affirmed of it, that as it is a judge whose decisions continually vary, as it operates in different minds, establishing in one what it rejects in another, so, it is impossible that it should ever afford any such criterion of right as can deserve our confidence, and trusting to it alone, we must for ever wander in the dark. But conscience, it will be said perhaps, is able to give us all the necessary light; conscience, a monitor placed in our breasts by God himself; evermore pointing out to us what is morally right, what wrong; disposing us to the practice of one, dissuading us from the practice of the other.* Now, that we have within us a certain faculty, approving and rewarding with self-complacency certain acts; disapproving of, and reproaching us for others, I am very willing to allow. But then that this faculty does of itself, and uniformly, point out, or approve, exactly those actions which are morally right, and only those, whilst it as uniformly disapproves of those which are morally wrong, this I deny. For the consciences of a Turk and a Christian approve the most opposite things in the world, and it is obviously impossible that both should approve only those actions which are morally right. But, it may be said that Turks or Christians neither of them afford fair instances of what the natural conscience would dictate or approve, for that both are the slaves of unnatural habit, shackled by prejudice, and brought up under the tyranny of forms and faith, which men have devised and imposed on their fellow men. And truly, the natural conscience, whatever it is, must necessarily exist most perfectly in those men who are nearest a state of nature; and if it be a perfect guide to any body, it must be so to them. Let us enquire then what is the fact. But, surely, sir, it cannot be necessary to examine this question; a question which almost all accounts of almost all savages decide against them.* It cannot be necessary to waste either my own time, or the reader's, in labouring to prove, that, though savages may possess some of the sterner virtues, yet, neither the love, practice, nor knowledge of pure morality dwell with them, or that they, and with them all other sorts and descriptions of men, not Christians, are far, very far, from having reached that moral standard to which we have attained. From all this I would infer, Sir, that as neither reason nor the natural conscience affords any certain guide to moral rectitude, or true religion, nor gives us any credible evidence that we practise them, nor even *appear* to constitute an authority of universal and paramount obligation; so, if there exist a rule of conduct affording any foreign evidence that it is and does all this, then is it the duty of rational beings to adopt it, and none other ought to have any weight; for there is none other whose evidence may not be adduced to prove equally the truth of opposing systems, and so give to every man, (for every man must be his own judge in that case) an independent standard or rule of right conduct peculiar to himself, or possessed by him in common with a few others. The crime of those who have had "the gospel preached unto them," and yet obey not its precepts, is exactly this therefore;—that they act upon a rule of conduct which is obviously imperfect, and entirely without credible evidence that it is right, (for it gives the same assurance of rectitude and safety to them supporting diametrically opposite systems) when they might adopt one which has some respectable external evidence, (evidence never overturned) that it is a perfect rule of moral and religious conduct, and comes from God himself. Far be it from me to suppose, that with heathens, conscience, whatever its dictates, is not the only guide that they are to expected to obey. St. Paul decides this question by saying, "these having not the law, are a law unto themselves.* This, however, has nothing to do with the present question, and affords no proof that conscience is a sure guide to moral and religious good, or one which it is safe to trust to when a better is at hand.

---

* This internal monitor which, enlightened by revelation, goads the Christian murderer in his most secret privacy, embitters also the death-bed of a North American Indian with the reflection that he has failed to wash out an injury received with the blood of the offender.

* I refer the reader to Dr. Clarke's Account of the Circassians, Dr. Robertson's History of the native Americans, and various accounts of the African negroes, the Tartars, the Arabs, and the Egyptians, who, though not all perhaps *strictly* savages, are much nearer a state of nature than ourselves.

[*To be concluded in our next.*]

JOHN MILTON.

Unus Patronus bonæ causæ satis est.
EPISCOPIUS.

No. XXXV.

Sabbath.

It is not the formal duty of worship, or the sitting still, that keeps the holy rest of sabbath; but whosoever doth most according to charity, whether he works or works not, he breaks the holy rest of sabbath least.

No. XXXVI.

Schism.

Schism is a rent or division in the church, when it comes to the separating of congregations; and may also happen to a true church as well as to a false; yet in the true needs not tend to the breaking of communion, if they can agree in the right administration of that wherein they communicate, keeping their other opinions to themselves, not being destructive to faith. The Pharisees and Sadducees were two sects, yet both met together in their common worship of God at *Jerusalem.* But here the Papist will angrily demand, What! Are Lutherans, Calvinists, Anabaptists, Socinians, Arminians, no heretics? I answer, *All these may have some errors,*

---

* Rom. ii. 14.

but are no heretics. Heresy is in the will and choice professedly against Scripture; error is against the will, in misunderstanding the Scripture, after all sincere endeavours to understand it rightly: hence it was said well by one of the ancients, *Err I may, but a heretic I will not be.* It is a human frailty to err, and no man is infallible here on earth. But so long as all these profess to set the word of God only before them as the rule of faith and obedience, and use all diligence and sincerity of heart, by reading, by learning, by study, by prayer for illumination of the Holy Spirit, to understand the rule and obey it, they have done what man can do: God will assuredly pardon them, as he did the friends of Job, good and pious men, tho' much mistaken, as there it appears, in some points of doctrine. But some will say, with Christians it is otherwise, whom God hath promised by his spirit to teach all things. True, all things absolutely necessary to salvation; but the hottest disputes among Protestants, calmly and charitably inquired into, will be found less than such.

The Lutheran holds consubstantiation; an error indeed, but not mortal. The Calvinist is taxt with predestination, and to make God the author of sin; not with any dishonourable thought of God, but it may be over-zealously asserting his absolute power, not without plea of Scripture. The Anabaptist is accused of denying infants their right to baptism; again they say, they deny nothing but what the Scripture denies them. The Arian and Socinian are charged to dispute against the Trinity: they affirm to believe the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to Scripture, and the apostolic creed; as for terms of Trinity, Triniunity, Co-essentiality, Tripersonality, and the like, they reject them as scholastic notions, not to be found in Scripture, which by a general Protestant maxim is plain and perspicuous abundantly to explain its own meaning, in the properest words, belonging to so high a matter, and so necessary to be known; a mystery indeed in their sophistic subtleties, but in Scripture a plain doctrine. Their other opinions are of less moment. They dispute the satisfaction of Christ, or rather the word *satisfaction*, as ~~not~~ scriptural: but they acknowledge him both God and their Saviour. The *Arminian*, lastly, is condemned for setting up free will against free grace; but the imputation he disclaims in all his writings, and grounds himself largely upon Scripture only. It cannot be denied that the authors or late revivers of all these sects or opinions were learned, worthy, zealous and religious men, as appears by their lives written, and the same of their many eminent and learned followers, perfect and powerful in the Scriptures, holy and unblameable in their lives: and it cannot be imagined that God would desert such painful and zealous labourers in his church, and ofttimes great sufferers for their conscience, to damnable errors and a reprobate sense, who had so often implored the assistance of his Spirit; but rather, having made no man infallible, that he hath pardoned their errors, and accepts their pious endeavours, sincerely searching all things according to the rule of Scripture, with such guidance and direction, as they can obtain of God by prayer. What Protestant then, who himself maintains the same principles, and disavows all implicit faith, would persecute and not rather charitably tolerate such men as these, unless he mean to abjure the principles of his own religion? If it asked, how far they should be tolerated? I answer, doubtless equally, as being all Protestants; that is, on all occasions to give account of their faith, either by arguing, preaching in their several assemblies, public writing and the freedom of printing. For if the *French* and *Polonian* Protestants enjoy all this liberty among Papists, much more may a Protestant justly expect it among Protestants; and yet sometimes here among us, the one persecutes the other upon every slight pretence.

No. XXXVII.

Self Confidence.

Glad therefore of such an able assistant, however at much distance, I resolved at length to put off into this wild and calumnious world. For God, it seems, intended to prove me, whether I durst alone take up a rightful cause against a world of disesteem, *and found I durst.*

No. XXXVIII.

Truth.

Truth indeed came once into the world with her divine Master, and was a perfect shape, most glorious to look on; but when he ascended, and his Apostles after him were laid asleep, then strait arose a wicked race of deceivers, who, as that story goes of the *Egyptian Typhon*, with his conspirators, how they dealt with the good *Osiris*, took the virgin Truth, hewed her lovely form into a thousand pieces, and scattered them to the four winds. From that time, ever since, the sad friends of Truth, such as durst appear, imitating the careful search that *Isis* made for the mangled body of *Osiris*, went up and down, gathering up limb by limb still as they could find them. We have not yet found them all, Lords and Commons, nor ever shall do, till her Master's second coming: he shall bring together every joint and member, and shall mould them into an immortal feature of loveliness and perfection. Suffer not these licensing prohibitions to stand at every place of opportunity, forbidding and disturbing them that continue seeking, that continue to do our obsequies to the torn body of our martyr'd saint.

No. XXXIX.

Toleration.

The Gospel commands us to tolerate one another, though of various opinions, and hath promised a good and happy event thereof; *Phil.* iii. 15. *Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded; and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you.* And we are bid, 1 *Thess.* v. 21. *Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.* St. Paul judged that not only to tolerate, but to examine and prove all things, was no danger to our holding fast of that which is good. How shall we prove all things, which includes all opinions at least founded on Scripture, unless we not only tolerate them, but patiently hear them and seriously read them? If he who thinks himself in the truth, professes to have learnt it, not by implicit faith, but by attentive study of the Scriptures and full persuasion of heart, with what equity can he refuse to hear or read him, who demonstrates to have gained his knowledge by the same way? Is it a fair course to assert truth by arrogating to himself the only freedom of speech, and stopping the mouths of others equally gifted? ——— There is no learned man but will confess he hath much profited by reading controversies, his senses awaked, his judgment sharpened, and the truth which he holds more firmly established. If then it be profitable for him to read, why should it not at least be tolerable and free for his adversaries to write?

No. XL.

Not born a Translator.

I could have added that eloquent and right Christian discourse, written by *Erasmus* on this argument, not disagreeing in effect from *Bucer*. But this I hope will be enough to excuse me with the meer *Englishman*, to be no forger of new and loose opinions. Others may read him in his own phrase on the first to the *Corinthians*, and ease me who never could delight in long citations, much less in whole traductions: whether it be natural disposition or education in me, or that *my mother bore me a speaker of what God made mine own, and not a translator.*

No. XLI.

Usurpations of Kings.

It must needs seem strange, where men accustom themselves to ponder and contemplate things in their first original and institution, that kings, who, as all other officers of the public, were at first chosen and installed only by consent and suffrage of the people, to govern them as free men by laws of their own making, and to be, in consideration of that dignity and riches bestowed upon them, the intrusted servants of the commonwealth, should, notwithstanding, grow up to that dishonest encroachment, as to esteem themselves masters both of that great trust which they serve, and of the people that betrusted them: counting what they ought to do, both in discharge of their public duty, and for the great reward of honour and revenue which they receive, as done all of meer grace and favour; as if their power over us were by nature, and from themselves, or that God had sold us into their hands. Indeed, if the race of kings were eminently the best of men, as the breed at Tutbury is of horses, it would in reason then be their part only to command, our's only to obey. But kings by generation no way excelling others, and most commonly not being the wisest or worthiest by far of whom they claim to have the governing; that we should yield them subjection to our own ruin, or hold of them the right of our common safety, and our natural freedom by meer gift from the superfluity of their royal grace and beneficence, we may be sure was never the intent of God, whose ways are just and equal: never the intent of nature, whose works are also regular; never of any people not wholly barbarous, whom prudence, or no more but human sense would have better guided when they first created kings, than so to nullify and tread to dirt the rest of mankind, by exalting one person and his lineage, without other merit looked after, but the mere contingency of a begetting, into an absolute and unaccountable dominion over them and their posterity.

No. XLII.

Wives.

Beza and others say that divorce was granted, not for men, but to release afflicted wives. Palpably uxorious! Who can be ignorant that woman was created for man, and not man for woman? and that a husband may be injured as insufferably in marriage as a wife? What an injury is it after wedlock not to be beloved, what to be slighted, what to be contended with in point of house-rule, who shall be the head; and not for any parity of wisdom, for that were something reasonable, but out of a female pride? *I suffer not,* saith St. Paul, *the woman to usurp autority over the man.* If the apostle could not suffer it, into what mould is he mortified that can? *Solomon* saith *that a bad wife is to her husband as rottenness to his bones, a continual dropping. Better dwell in the corner of the house-top, or in the wilderness, than with such a one. Whoso hideth her, hideth the wind, and one of the four mischiefs that the earth cannot bear.* If the spirit of God wrote such aggravations as these, and (as may be guest by these similitudes) counsels the man rather to divorce than to live with such a colleague; and yet on the other side expresses nothing of the wife's sufferings with a bad husband: Is it not most likely that God in his law had more pity towards man thus wedlocked, than towards the woman that was created for another? The same spirit relates to us the course which the Medes and Persians took by occasion of *Vashti,* whose meer denial to come at her husband's sending, lost her the being Queen any longer, and set up a wholesome law, *that every man should bear rule in his own house.* And the divine relater shews us not the least sign of disliking what was done; how should he, if Moses long before was nothing less mindful of the honour and pre-eminence due to man!

GLEANINGS; OR, SELECTIONS AND REFLECTIONS MADE IN A COURSE OF GENERAL READING.

No. CXXXIX.

Daniel De Foe an Universalist.

Daniel De Foe was educated and continued through life in the profession of an orthodox Nonconformist. Nor did he escape the imputation of being even an enemy to *religious* liberty. It has however been conjectured in the following passage, by Dr. Kippis, that the author of Robinson Crusoe might possibly be disposed to soften the rigors of Calvinism, on one essential point.

"Many fine displays of natural sentiment occur in Robinson Crusoe's man *Friday,* and there is on which, in reading it, appeared to the present writer particularly striking. It is in the conversation which Crusoe has with *Friday* concerning the devil. *Friday*, being informed by his master that God was stronger than the devil, asks, *if God much strong, much might as the devil, why God not kill the devil, so make him no more wicked?* At this question Crusoe was greatly surprised and embarrassed; but, having recovered himself a little, he answered, that God would at last punish the devil severely; that he is reserved for judgment, and is to be cast into the bottomless pit, to dwell with everlasting fire. Still, however, *Friday* not being satisfied, returns upon his master, repeating his words; *Reserve at last! Me no understand: but why not kill the devil now, not kill great ago?* 'You may as well ask me,' replied Crusoe, 'why God does not kill you and me, when we do wicked things here that offend him; we are preserved to repent and be pardoned.' At this *Friday* mused awhile, and then said, mighty affectionately: *Well, well, that well; so you, I, devil, all wicked, all preserve, repent, God pardon all.* Perhaps it would be going too far to assert, that De Foe intended covertly to insinuate that there might be a more merciful distribution of things, in the final results of Divine Providence than he dared at that time openly to exhibit." Biog. Brit. 2d. ed. V. 60 and 75.

No. CXL.

Mahometan Calvinism.

God hath revealed a most excellent discourse; a book conformable to itself, and containing repeated admonitions. . . . . . . This is the direction of God: he will direct thereby whom he pleaseth; and whomsoever God shall cause to err, he shall have no director. Shall he therefore who shall be obliged to screen himself with his face from the severity of the punishment on the day of resurrection, be as he who is secure therefrom? And it shall be said unto the ungodly, Taste that which ye have deserved.

Koran, (*Sale's*) *V. II. p.* 328.

No. CXLI.

A Mourning Mother.

The lady of a noble Venetian lost her only son, and in consequence became a prey to the most excruciating sorrow. A reverend prelate, to console her, reminded her, among other things, how great must have been the affliction of Abraham, who, nevertheless, without murmuring, obeyed the commands of heaven, and was prepared to sacrifice his beloved, his only son! Ah! holy father, replied the lady, in all the poignant emphasis of grief—God would never have exacted such a sacrifice of a *mother!*

No. CXLII.

Illuminations in Heaven.

Poets have seen strange sights in heaven, but none a stranger than that described by Sir Richard Blackmore, viz. an *illumination!* This fine spectacle was exhibited on the creation of man, when, the *sacred* poet contented himself with fancying *the sons of God shouting for joy.*

Now when the evening came, or what instead
Of evening there does in its turn succeed
Glorious Illuminations made on high
By all the stars and planets of the sky,
In just degrees and shining order plac'd,
Spectators charm'd and the bless'd dwellings grac'd.
Thro' all th' inlighten'd air swift *Fireworks* flew,
Which with repeated shouts glad cherubs threw.
Comets ascended with their sweeping train,
Then fell in starry show'rs and glitt'ring rain.
In air ten thousand meteors blazing hung,
Which from th' eternal battlements were flung,
Such universal joy in heav'n they shew'd,
Such mirth and triumph did the day conclude.

Prince Arthur. B. ii. 4th ed. 18mo. (1714) pp. 49, 50.

No. CXLIII.

Sentiment from Mirabeau.

Alas, what do we gain by *hating* men. In order to live among them must we not practice forbearance! Have they not all more of good than bad. Let us not exaggerate: if we paint the *dangers* that surround us, let us not conceal our multiplied pleasures. We talk of our misfortunes and forget our felicities We behold, it is said, more of vice and suffering, than of virtue and enjoyment; but this is not true, for the world continues and society subsists. If there were more of evil than of good we should all be annihilated.

No. CXLIV.

William Penn.

(From an American Magazine.)

Penn, the founder and legislator of the colony of Pennsylvania, had both great and amiable qualities, and was no stranger to the essentials of good breeding, though he was too stubborn to yield to the forms of it. He had, or affected to have, all the spirit of the *Hat*, which availed him much as the leader of a people who made it part of their religion. We are informed that he sat with his hat on before Charles II. and the king, as a gentle rebuke for his ill manners, put off his own. Upon which Penn said to him, "Friend Charles, why dost thou not keep on thy hat?" The king answered, "It is the custom of this place that never above *one* person should be covered at a time."

No. CXLV.

Consolation for the Afflicted.

A poor Dervise, whose feet were naked for want of shoes, made a pilgrimage to Mecca, cursing his unhappy fate and accusing heaven of cruelty. When he arrived at the gate of the grand mosque of Coufa, he perceived a poor man who had by some accident lost both his feet. The sight of a man more unfortunate than himself afforded him consolation, and convinced him that the distress was greater to be without *feet* than without *shoes*.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

Mr. Jones's Vindication of the Common Greek Text in Acts, xx. 28.

The reply made by Dr. Lloyd does more credit to his pen as a scholar than to his candour as an enquirer after truth. The only question in which the public are concerned respects the purity of the common text in Acts. xx. 28: and this I will proceed to establish to the confusion of *Griesbach* and Dr. Lloyd.

First, The authority of versions and manuscripts, though denied by Dr. L. greatly preponderates in favour of *του ϑεου*. For the Arabic version reads *Lord God.* The author of the Syriac was a believer in the divinity of Christ; and he seems to have inserted the term corresponding to *Dominus* as an interpretation of *του ϑεου*. This is no more than what every critic would have done under the influence of the same bias. Of the Æthiopic, Griesbach says, "*Æthiops* habet vocabulum, quo semper utitur sive ϑεος in Græca veritate legatur, sive *κυριος*. Neutri igitur lectioni, si solus spectetur, favet." What is the reader to understand by this assertion? Assuredly, that in the Æthiopic version a word is used which, like *Lord* in English, or *κυριος* in Greek, applies to Jesus Christ, as well as to God. This, Wakefield asserts "to be infamously false." Such a charge against a critic of so grave and honoured a name ought either not to have been made, or to be justified Dr. L. takes it for granted that Mr. W. is mistaken: and holds him forth to scorn and censure as no critic. It is time that Wakefield should be vindicated, and the disgrace transferred to Griesbach. The original term, in the Æthiopic version, is YGZY BAHER. Ludolph. in p. 286 of his Lexicon, explains this to mean, Deus ter optimus ter maximus; and then adds, Cui (i. e deo), *soli hoc nomen tribuitur.* It is a compound word explained by the Æthiopians to mean *Lord of regions.* Walton under the Hebrew אגז *ugaz* interprets the same word as meaning, "Dominus universæ regionis;" and then subjoins *Soli Deo tribuitur.* Thus is Mr. Wakefield vindicated, and Griesbach dishonoured by one of the grossest misrepresentations that can occur in the whole compass of biblical criticism. Dr. Lloyd may affect not to be implicated in this vindication; but he cannot by such affectation blind his readers; and if he were candid, he would acknowledge his error and kiss the rod. I do not indeed adopt Mr. W's. interpretation of the verse. He is, I think, mistaken, but his mistake can be accounted for without supposing in him a defect of judgment, or a want of skill in his art. The supposition is harsh and ungenerous; and would be condemned by all candid and competent judges. Luke who wrote the Acts was undoubtedly a Jew; and as such, though he *wrote* in Greek, *thought* in Hebrew. Mr. W. might suppose, as Michaelis did, that he was a *Gen-*

tile, or at least a *Hellenistic Jew*, i. e: a Jew born and bred in a Gentile country; and being accustomed to the language and phraseology of Greece, he, or the apostle Paul, whose address to the Gentile converts he relates, might insensibly use an idiom sanctioned by the purest Greek writers. The Editor of the Monthly Repository shewed me an eminent biblical critic who, before the days of Wakefield, has given the very same interpretation and justifies the rendering of *αιμα* or sanguis, by *son*, on the authority of Homer and Virgil.

Secondly, The authority of *manuscripts* greatly preponderates in favour of *του ϑεου*, over *του ϰυριου*. This Dr. Lloyd denies, but it is to no purpose to contradict a fact. Some manuscripts, and the Vulgate, it is allowed, read *του ϑεου*. And here we should remember Griesbach's own words; "Itaque legendum erit vel *ϰυριου*, vel *ϰυριου ϰαι ϑεου*. Posterior lectio habetur in 47 græcis libris, hoc est in majore codicum adhuc collatorum parte." These forty-seven manuscripts then sanction *του ϑεου* as the genuine reading; and as they evidently apply the words to *God*, they militate against *του ϰυριου*, as intended for *Christ*. But let us suppose that the ancient authorities are nearly balanced. I will still prove from other considerations the genuine reading to be *του ϑεου*.

1.—No such reading as *εϰϰλησια του ϰυριου* occurs in any other part of the N. T. The presumption then is that it is not the true reading in this place. On the other hand, the phrase *εϰϰλησια του ϑεου* was most familiar with the apostle Paul: and the frequency and uniformity with which it occurs, shew that in the apostolic age it had in its application to the assemblies of Christians acquired something similar to the invariable and fixed use of a proper name. Add to this that, in the context, the writer uses the expressions, "the gospel of the grace *of God*," "the counsel *of God*," "the kingdom *of God*." The mere impulse of association would therefore have led him here to add, "the church *of God*" in preference to "the church *of the Lord*," especially as the former phrase was most familiar to him. And the latter not at all.

2d. The apostolic writers, and after them the more early fathers, employed the phrase "Church of God," to denote the Catholic believers, in opposition to the *heretics* or assemblies of *worldly men*. I repeat the following instance from my *Sequel*. "As God," says Origen, "who sent Jesus, having defeated all the artifices of demons, has so ordered it that the gospel of Jesus, should prevail every where for reforming mankind; and that there should be every where teachers governed by law, different from the churches of superstitious, intemperate and unrighteous men. For such are the manners of most of those who belong to the churches of the cities. But the churches *of God* instructed by Christ, compared with the churches of the people among whom they live, are as lights in the world. And who is there that must not acknowledge that the worst of those who are in the church, and are inferior to the rest, are better than most of those who are in the churches of the people. For instance, the church *of God* at Athens is quiet, mild and well-behaved, being desirous to approve itself to God, who is over all. But the church of the Athenians is turbulent, and by no means comparable to the church *of God* there. The same you must also acknowledge of the church *of God* at Corinth, and the church of the people of the Corinthians; as you must also allow of the church *of God* at Alexandria, and the church of the people of the Alexandrians. Every one who is candid and diligently attends to these things with a mind open to conviction will admire him who formed this design, and has accomplished it, that there should be every where churches of God, dwelling with the churches of the people in every city: and if you observe the senate of the church *of God*, and the senate in every city, you will find some senators of the church worthy to govern in the city of God all over the world, if there were such a thing. And on the other hand, you will find that the senators of cities have nothing in their behaviour to render them worthy of the distinction allotted them. And if you compare the presidents of the churches *of God* with the presidents of the people in the cities, you will find the senators and governors of the churches, though some may be inferior to others who are most perfect; nevertheless you will find them to excel in virtue the senators and governors of the cities." In this and similar passages, "the church of God" means a people devoted to God by superior virtue in opposition to other men. The apostle uses the phrase with the same point or contrast in the disputed verse, as he evidently alludes to the Gnostic impostors calling them *wolves* who wished to devour the flock. Read *εκκλησια του κυριου* and the contrast is quite destroyed.

3. The reading of *του κυριου* is intended to solve a difficulty which can be solved in another and better way. I expressed my belief that a noun intended to limit the object of a verb cannot be made the subject of another in the same sentence. Instances however may occur of this construction though not justified by the common use of language. Thus *του θεου* repeated and changed cannot naturally, much less necessarily, be taken as the agent to *περιεποιησατο*; nor could the reader think of such a thing, unless he were driven on this expedient by the absence of an appropriate nominative case. But the expedient is not requisite here; as in speaking and writing it is usual with all men to omit the leading subject of discourse if it were notorious from the context who that subject might be. Thus "Feed the church of God, which *he*—he who under God is the principal subject of my preaching—he on whose death I insist in opposition to the deceivers that deny his death,—secured with his blood." Examples of this omission are not unfrequent in the N. T. Thus, "Beloved, now we are the children *of God*: and it doth not yet appear what we shall be. But we know that when *he* appears we shall be like unto him." 1 John iii. 2. If we interpret this passage by the strict rules of grammar, *he* must be taken for *God*, the only antecedent beforementioned. But it evidently means

Jesus. And this is a case exactly in point. Again, "In this we know the love *of God*, because *he* laid down his life for us." 1 John iii. 16. The common translation has *of God* in italics; because του ϑεου is not in many copies of the original. Some authorities however have it, and I doubt not but that *την αγαπην του ϑεου* came from the hands of the apostle. The *love* mentioned is assuredly the love of God the Father; and it is thus referred to him in many parallel passages. See John iii. 16. Rom. v. 8. viii. 32. 1 John iv. 9. If then the passage can be explained on this principle, all argument for του κυριου falls like dead weight to the ground.

4. Lastly. The reading of του κυριου, if false, can easily be accounted for; as it is but a wrong interpretation dictated by a mistaken notion of Christ. The authors of all the versions and manuscripts were believers in his divinity: and as they were disposed to wrest every passage in defence of that doctrine, they wrote κυριου in explanation of ϑεου on the margin of their copies; which in time crept into the text: and this will account for the reading of ϑεου και κυριου. In their discourses or apologies they also quoted the passage with this explanation; and the quotation became in time considered an *authentic reading.* On the other hand, the reading of του ϑεου, if not genuine, implies the most improbable violence. For it would be then a *direct and deliberate forgery*, and such a forgery as no one would attempt; because if it passed for the genuine reading, it would afford but a remote and doubtful argument for the divinity of Christ. Which reading then is the more improbable, that which is the dictate of fraud, or of prejudice? We daily see the effects of the latter in the versions and interpretations of many good, but mistaken men. Whereas, those of the former seldom occur.—Through every age the jealousies and animosities of different sects, the respect which all parties paid to the scriptures as they were delivered by Christ and his apostles; the great variety of copies, and the difficulty of producing uniformity precluded the successful attempt at forgery among any class of Christians. These causes have guarded the Greek text with scrupulous accuracy; nor is there a passage in the N. T. with the exception of the introductory chapters in Matthew and Luke, and the three witnesses in John, that betrays the hand of fraud.

These arguments when known and examined will for ever settle the genuineness of the common Greek reading, and dissipate the rubbish which Griesbach has heaped together under the appearance of learning.

JOHN JONES.

Dr. Lloyd's Translation of the principal and most essential part of Griesbach's note on Acts xx. 28.

SIR,

If no one of your learned correspondents should have furnished you with a complete translation of Griesbach's note on Acts xx. 28. a part of it which I now send, and which, perhaps, will be found faithfully rendered, is at your service.

The first portion of the learned critic's note is occupied in giving a summary of the authorities for the different readings of the text, as deduced from M.SS. from Versions, and from the Fathers. To none would it be of the least use to copy the numerous abbreviations which he employs, while the revision of the proof, as well as the printing, would occasion no small perplexity. To fill up those abbreviations would be a task to which my time and resources render me inadequate. And the unlearned reader would derive little benefit from the performance. The learned theologian cannot be without the original. The critic's review of the evidence, which forms the greater and more important half of the note in question, will, probably, be found to answer every valuable purpose, although I frankly confess that the difficulty of rendering it completely intelligible to the English reader is far more formidable than I suspected when I took the liberty of recommending its appearance in your excellent Magazine.

C. LL.

N. B. The various readings which Griesbach has thought deserving of any notice, are *του θεου, του κυριου, του κυριου και θεου του θεου και κυριου, του κυριου θεου*, and *του χριστου*. He scarcely deigns to consider the three last, because they are nearly without authority.—TRANSLATOR.

"That the reader may himself judge of the character of the manuscripts which contain the reading *θεου*, let him run over the margin of Wetstein's edition, in the Acts of the Apostles, from the beginning to the end, and observe the readings of those M.SS. as there furnished. But if he has it not in his power to peruse that edition, I will here present to his attention some things which I have observed on reviewing, with this intention, all that medley of various readings.

I. Codex 4,* written so late as the 15th century, contains an immense number of various, and even singular readings, partly valuable, and partly to be rejected without hesitation: as, for example, Acts ix. 20. xi. 3, &c. &c. Compare also Rom. xiv. 17. xvi. 13. 2 Cor. ii. 17. 1 Thess. iv. 15. Therefore, this copy, when alone, or when agreeing with others of small merit, is of no importance.

II. Codex 7. is seldom quoted;† so that it appears to be either supported by an assemblage of other M.SS. or possessed of additions altogether peculiar to itself:‡ for example, Acts xxi. 16. xxii. 20, 23, &c. &c.

III. Codex 12 and 22 are to be accounted nearly as not collated; and for that reason they are to be looked upon as of no authority. Codex 22, as far as I can judge, from the few readings of it which have come to my knowledge, is near of kin to Codex 4, and Codex 37.§ This copy alone has *θεος*, God, in James iv. 15. instead of *κυριος*, Lord.

IV. Codex 25 is to be considered in the number of the better, though not of the best M.SS. See Wetstein at Acts v. 24. xi. 21,

---

* This is the manner in which the different copies of the original are distinguished, according to a table given at the beginning of each volume of Griesbach's edition of the Greek Testament.—*Translator.*

† i. e. probably, is seldom referred to, by Wetstein, on any occasion.—*Trans.*

‡ These are the reasons why it is seldom noticed by Wetstein.—*Trans.*

§ See No. I. above, and No. V. below.—*Trans.*

&c. &c. It seldom or never agrees with the M.SS. which, in this place, read θεου, but belongs to another family.*

V. Codex 37 is every where interpolated by glosses and absurd interpretations, of which that should be especially compared with our present text, which is read at Acts xiii. 41. in this copy and among the scholia of Matthæi's copy *d;* thus, *οτι ο θεος σταυρουται και αποθνησκει, God is crucified and dies.* Besides, respecting this copy 37, compare Wets. at Acts ii. 24, xii. 20, &c. &c, and in the Epistles of Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 29, &c. &c.

VI. Codex 64 and 65, which are those of Vienna, very seldom furnish a reading of better note, if the same be not found in a great many other M.SS.

VII. The Upsal Codex, 68, sometimes, to be sure, agrees with the best copies, as may be seen even from my selection of various readings in this work; but when it differs from these in the Acts, as in this place, it coincides with the second edition of the works of Theophylact, containing a text and commentary of the Acts, which has been published by Finettus, and which I am accustomed to refer to under the designation of *Theoph.* 2. From these things it is easy to judge of the character, age and country of this Upsal copy. If any one should wish to weigh more accurately the value of the readings which are either peculiar to this manuscript, or common to it and a few others only, may consult in Aurivillius, who published the Upsal variations, the following places, Acts ix. 24. xii. 13, &c. &c.

VIII. All the other M.SS. which have, or appear to have, θεου, that is to say, 16. 23. 39. 46. 56. nay, and even 4. 7. 22. and 37. are related to one another by a close affinity. Consult Wets. at Acts xi. 28. xii. 25, &c. &c. All that can be said of this whole family of M.SS. is, merely that it does not always differ from the good readings of the few copies. But readings to be found in this set alone, if some belonging to Codex 16 be excepted, are of very little value.

From all these things it clearly appears that θεου is not supported by even one good MS. which, from its antiquity, or its intrinsic excellence, can be complimented with the title of a competent and uncorrupted witness. It is not found, except in modern copies, and those either to be altogether despised, or miserably interpolated, at least in many places. Nor yet is it capable of supporting itself by the authority of versions. For no translation has θεου, except the modern Vulgate, which the more ancient Latin M.SS. contradict, and the Philoxenian Syriac, which was done in the sixth century only, and even this itself furnishes κυριου in the margin. And, lastly, no certain indications of the reading θεου can be traced in the Fathers before Epiphanius (who, even in the MS. copy belonging to the library of the University of Jena, has θεου at both the places above cited,*) and Ambrose. I cannot, therefore, understand how, in consistency with the laws of criticism, the reading *ϑεου*, destitute as it is of all proper authority, can be defended.

---

* The manuscripts are divided into three families, as it is expressed, as they severally proceeded from the revisions or editions, as they are called, of the West, of Alexandria, and of Constantinople. *Trans.*

Nor can an enlightened judge be satisfied with the reading *χριςτου*, which the Syriac,† with its follower, the Erpenian Arabic version, and a very few of the fathers furnish. For it is found in no Greek copy, but is a gloss, intended to explain the sense of the ambiguous word *ϰυριου*; because, if the authors of the gloss‡ had found *θεου* in their Greek copies, the phrase *του υιου του θεου* would have appeared to them, without the shadow of a doubt, far more suitable, as an interpretation of that word, than the word *χριστου*.

Therefore we shall be obliged to read either *ϰυριου*, or *ϰυριου ϰαι θεου*. The latter reading is found in 47 Greek M.SS. that is, in the greater part of the copies that have been yet collated. But 1. Not one of the most ancient copies is found in this multitude. For Codex G. although in capital letters, yet in the opinion of Montfaulcon, was not written before the ninth century. 2. Not one of the most excellent copies, and but scarcely one here and there of the others which exhibit in many places some good and ancient readings, such as 26. 27. 29. 31. and Matthæi's 1. reads *ϰυριου, ϰαι θεου*. 3. No version supports this reading, except the Polyglott Arabic,‖ that sink of the most recent and abominable readings, and the Sclavonic version, made in the ninth century, from copies of the Constantinople edition, *recensio*. 4. This reading has been met with in the writings of not one of the fathers, whether Greek or Latin, Theophylact alone excepted; while the second and third editions, however, by Finettus, of the commentaries on the Acts, attributed to him, contradict even this exception. 5. This reading was manifestly fabricated out of two readings of different M.SS. From the same source came *ϰυριου ϑεου*, without the copulative found in Cod. 3. and *ϑεου ϰυριου*, inverting the order of the words which is read in Cod. 7.*

---

* In the former part of this note. *Trans.*

† The Peschito. *Trans.*

‡ That is, the Syriac translators and the fathers. *Trans.*

‖ The Arabic of the Polyglott has, in fact, *του ϰυριου θεου*, as Griesbach had observed before.—*Tran.*

* The translator presumes to differ entirely from the learned critic in this account of the irreption of these readings into the M.SS. It is indubitable, and would be proved, if necessary, by numerous examples, that the Librarii, transcribers, frequently *orthodoxized*. Of this, proofs are to be met with even in this celebrated note of Griesbach. They could not resist the opportunity of adding *θεου* to *ϰυριου*. which would give *him* who shed his *own blood* one of the highest and most appropriate titles of the Supreme being. They could have no motive of adequate force to insert *ϰυριου*, if their copies had *θεου*, unless it should be *after ϑεου*, which has not been done but by one copyist. I am prepared to shew that, in that situation, it might have related to Jesus Christ, in contradistinction from *του θεου*, contrary to the laboured, but futile deduction of Dr. Middleton, in his work on the Greek Article, otherwise highly valuable; and, if that should be made out, the incongruity of ascribing *blood* to the Almighty would have been avoided, if the transcribers, good souls, felt any anxiety on that head. But of this there is not the least indication, as they all but one inserted

Now since all these things are so, I cannot help preferring *κυριου* to all the other readings. (1.) The most *ancient copies ;* copies *proceeding from different families ;* the most *excellent copies*, and such as seldom or never agree in any reading without producing the approbation of the most skilful critics; the copies which merit these various characters read *κυριος*. See, for example, Acts ii. 13. 17. iii. 11. &c. &c. (2.) The ancient Versions, whether made from the Alexandrian or Western recension, confirm the same reading. And (3.) the fathers, in sufficient number, and of sufficient antiquity, both Greek and Latin, concur. In the whole of the Acts of the Apostles I have followed the same witnesses as in this place support *κυριου*, if they were found to agree in their testimony. Wherefore, I should not have been consistent with myself, if, while relying on their authority, I had determined otherwise than I have done.

But it may be objected, 1st, that *κυριου* crept in from the version of the Seventy, in which *εκκλησια του κυριου* very often occurs, whence this expression was familiar to the book-writers; and, while they were careless what they were doing, dropped from their pen. I answer: *θεου* more probably crept in, either from a parallel place, 1 Pet. v. 2, *ποιμανατε το εν υμιν ποιμνιον του θεου, επισκοπουντες, κ. τ. λ.*, or from the epistles of Paul, in which *εκκλησια του θεου*, the church of God, occurs eleven times, *εκκλησια του χριστου*, the church of Christ, but once only, and *εκκλησια του κυριου*, the church of the Lord, not once. The book-makers, therefore, who copied the M. SS. of the N. T., catched up a form of expression exceedingly familiar to them, both from their own reading and from the public recitation of it. 2ndly, in a speech delivered by Paul, that reading appears to be worthy of preference, which is more agreeable to the apostle's manner of speaking in other places, and that is, as we have seen, *εκκλησια του θεου*, the church of God. I answer: the substance of this speech was not committed to writing by Paul himself, but by Luke, who is accustomed to employ *εκκλησια*, the church, simply, without any addition. There is no propriety, therefore, in appealing to the style of Paul in this question. Nay, in this very speech, the Father is always so distinguished from the Son, that the former is invariably called *θεος*, God, and the latter *κυριος*, Lord; v. 19, 21, 24, 25, 27, 32, 35. The same distinction ought, therefore, to be observed in v. 28. 3rdly. The more unusual, difficult, harsh, and apparently false reading, of which description is that which ascribes *αιμα*, *blood*,

---

κυριου before ϑεου, if *κυριου* be the insertion, which I deny. Had they been puzzled by the attribution of *blood* to the *Almighty*, how was it possible that they should have gone to magnify the difficulty; by the introduction of *κυριου* in *such* a conjunction with *ϑεου* as increases the force of the epithet a thousand fold But, on the supposition that they orthodoxized, some would substitute *ϑεος*, at first, perhaps, as a gloss, for *κυριος*, and at length as a part of the text; and some would add it to *κυριος* with the copulative, till the whole variation was completed. If *ϑεος* had been the reading of the autograph, the present variety cannot be accounted for on any rational principle.

του θεου, *to God*, ought to be preferred to all others.* I answer: this canon of criticism is to be understood of a difficult and unusual reading which is supported by the authority at least of *some* grave and ancient witnesses. For, a reading, clearly destitute of competent witnesses, can by no means be defended on the ground of its difficulty merely. Besides, in that age in which the copies now remaining were transcribed, the form of expression in discussion was neither altogether unusual, nor did it seem at that time harsh or false to most Catholics. These, on the contrary, took delight in dainty morsels of this nature, and frequently used them as an indubitable token, and, as it were, a pledge of their orthodoxy. If then it had been written in express terms, ' θεος δια του ιδιου αιματος· περιεποιησατο την εκκλησιαν, *God with his own blood purchased the church*,' the ancient theologians, in their controversies with heretics of various descriptions concerning the natures and person of Christ, would, without doubt, have appealed again and again to so remarkable a text. But so far were they from using this weapon in demolishing their adversaries, that on the contrary, the more ancient fathers, and, among them, even Athanasius himself against Apollinaris, deny that αιμα θεου, *the blood of God*, is to be found in the holy scriptures. 4thly. It may be objected, that the copies which have κυριου και θεου do in a manner confirm the reading of θεου.† It is answered as often as two readings are exhibited in conjunction, that, which appears alone in the greater number of the more ancient and more excellent copies, is to be considered as preferable to that which is not found alone except in a few records, and those more recent and of less value.—5thly. The Latin book-writers probably set down DNI, domini, instead of DEI; and from such Latin copies those Greek M.SS. which have κυριου were, perhaps, corrupted. Answer: The more ancient Latin books favour the reading Domini, and the more modern ones only favour the reading, Dei. Besides, I trust that no critic of the present age will give credit to the exploded fable of the Greek copies latinizing.‡

On the use of Vocal and Instrumental Music in Public Worship. Part II.

(Continued from p. 466.)

7. Tertullian (a Carthaginian writer who flourished at the end of the second and the beginning of the third century,) is our next authority. He affords us very considerable room to believe, that in his time and country singing was employed in the public worship of the Christians. " There

---

* This is an approved canon of criticism which Griesbach has adopted in the preface to his edition. *Trans.*

† This is a curious argument, as if they do not also confirm the reading κυριου. Indeed, they confirm little or nothing in the question. *Trans.*

‡ Probably we should except from this observation the copy, D, of Theodore Beza, the Cambridgeman of Dr. Kipling, which copy seems to latinize. See Appendix to Dr. Middleton on the Greek Article. *Trans.*

is among us," he says, "at this day, a sister who has obtained the gift of revelation, which she experiences by a spiritual ecstasis, in the church, during the solemnities of the Lord's day. She converses with angels, and sometimes also with the Lord;" "and while the scriptures are read, or the psalms sung, or the discourses delivered, or the prayers offered, materials for her visions are supplied by them."*—This passage decisively proves that devotional singing was employed among the social religious exercises of the Christians; but it does not appear certain, whether Tertullian refers solely to their public worship, properly so called, or includes the religious exercises during their agapæ or love feasts. If the latter, the singing alluded to might have been that which we know, from another passage, was employed during the agapæ: but the natural meaning of the above quotation, is decidedly in favour of the supposition that Tertullian refers to singing in public worship; and I think this supported by the circumstance, that he understood Pliny as stating (in the passage already quoted in § ii. p. 461.) that the Christians in Asia Minor *sang* their hymn in praise of Christ. The only difficulty is, that when he is expressly speaking of the public worship of the Christians,† he does not mention singing: but neither does he the reading of the scriptures; and he is not, like Justin Martyr, giving a regular detail of the distinct parts and manner of their public worship.

At the conclusion of Tertullian's account of their agapæ,† we find that "*whoever was able* was called out into the middle, to sing a psalm to God, from the Holy Scriptures, or of his own composing." This is, I believe, the only intimation we have of the *nature* of the social singing among the Carthaginian Christians, in Tertullian's time; and we seem to have ground to infer from it, that their public devotional singing was similar to that which (if it really were singing) was practised among the Christians of whom Pliny speaks; it was performed by a single individual in the presence of his fellow Christians. (See p. 462.)

There are, as far as I can find, only two other passages in Tertullian's works referring to singing, which are quoted in King's Primitive Church, P. II. ch. i. § 4, 6. These clearly prove that singing was common among the Carthaginian Christians in his time, in their more private exercises of devotion; but they do not at all affect our present inquiry.

It may be observed that we have no reason to suppose Tertullian acquainted with the constitution and discipline of the European or Asiatic churches; and it is clear, that we derive no information from him, quite decisive as to the *practice* of the Carthaginian Christians on the subject of instrumental music with their devotional singing, and no information whatever as to their *opinions* respecting it.—I see, however, no reason to suppose that they did employ it with their devotional singing.

---

* De anima, c. ix. p. 270. Par. 1675.

† Apology, c. 39.

† Or as Ld. King erroneously supposes, of the Lord's supper. Apol. c. xxxix. p. 32.

8. Our next evidence is Origen (A. D. 184—253), one of the most truly eminent among the fathers for abilities and virtues. He must have been well acquainted with the practice of the Alexandrian, and of the Grecian and Asiatic churches. Though too late to be of very great importance in our inquiry, what he says connected with the subject must at least be interesting, and I feel disappointed at my inability to add any thing to the passage quoted in King's Primitive Church, (ch. i. § 5), or even to ascertain its full import, as I have no access to the work of Origen's in which that passage occurs. Origen there represents it as impossible, without the aid of the divine spirit, to sing (ψαλαι) with good modulation or in good time, or harmoniously to praise (ὑμνησαι) the Father by Christ. This passage (which is quoted from the Treatise De Oratione, § vi. p. 7.) if ψαλλω had not yet lost its appropriate signification, (see p. 464, note ‡) affords a presumptive proof that the Christians in Origen's time, in the countries where he lived, employed instrumental music with their devotional singing; but I imagine that it particularly refers to their more private exercises of devotion.

Such, Sir, is all the original evidence I can collect from any quarter respecting the practice of the Christians of the first two centuries immediately succeeding the death of Christ; and I think it will be allowed on all sides to afford no guide as to the practice and directions of the apostles. It affords, I admit, no corroboration to the conclusions I drew from my examination of the New Testament; nor, on the other hand, does it in any way oppose them.—The fact appears to be, that (though what we know respecting the practice and general directions of the apostles, may afford us some guidance as to the conduct of public worship,) too little is known to enable us to form an authoritative system of regulations on the subject; that they left the matter as they found it, to be determined by circumstances which are continually varying, according to the manners and customs of the age, the degree of mental culture, &c. and that all we have to do, is to take care that our practice is accordant with the principles of the human mind, and with the spiritual nature of Christian worship. The worship must have nothing in it to fetter the mind to feelings inconsistent with the latter; nor must it be so remote from the former, as to have nothing accordant with the actual state of humanity, and to be fit only for minds which have reached the highest states of refinement both of intellect and of affection.

From the data which I have collected, few conclusions of a positive nature can be securely drawn, but the following inferences appear to myself tolerably satisfactory.

1. During those periods in which persecution was most prevalent among the Roman, Grecian, and Asiatic Christians, singing seldom if ever formed a part of their public worship.

2. During the same periods, the arts would be little cultivated among them; and instrumental music would, from the same cause, naturally fall into disuse. The circumstances of the Christians as

a persecuted people would be aided in producing this effect by the licentious use which was made of music in the public spectacles and religious rites of the heathens.

3. Among the Alexandrian Christians in the latter part of the 2d century, singing was very common in their more private devotional exercises, and probably also in their public worship; and the use of instrumental music in the former (at least) appears not to have been regarded by them as blameworthy, because sanctioned by the practice of the pious psalmist. As this argument equally holds with respect to their singing in social worship, it may be inferred that whatever were their *practice*, their *principles* did not oppose the use of it there also.*

4. As far as we can collect respecting the singing of the African Christians in the second century, it did not resemble our congregational singing, but was performed by a single individual, or at most by a part only of the congregation.

5. That we have no means of coming to any general conclusion respecting the practice and opinions of the Christians in the age succeeding the apostolic, as to the employment of instrumental and vocal music in devotional exercises; nor consequently to any conclusion whatever, except from the scriptures, respecting the practice and opinions of the apostles themselves. There is nothing (as far as I can discover,) in the contemporary records of the first two centuries, which can invalidate the conclusions formerly drawn from an examination of the N. T. (See p. 127.)

While examining Burney's History of Music and Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, I made some memoranda, a few of which it may be desirable to add here, as illustrative of the progress of devotional music, and others as opposing my own views of the subject.

Burney says (vol. ii. p. 9), "Eusebius tells us that a regular choir and method of singing the service were first introduced, and hymns used in the church, at Antioch, the capital of Syria, during the time of Constantine (A. D. 306—337), and that St. Ambrose who had long resided there, had his melodies thence."—It is not, however, to be inferred from this passage (even if correctly stated by Burney), that singing had not been previously employed at all in the public worship of the Christian church. It was one of the *charges* made against Paul of Samosata (A. D. 270.) "that he abolished the Psalms which were wont to be sung to the honour of our Lord Jesus Christ, as novel, and composed by modern authors; and that he appointed women to sing psalms in honour of himself, in the midst of the church, on the great day of the passover."—I suppose this was originally said in the same way as it now sometimes is, that such a one sings to his own praise and glory.

---

* What really was their practice I cannot absolutely decide to my own satisfaction. The argument in favour of their employing instrumental music in public worship, I have already stated (see p. 464.); on the other hand it may be supposed that Clemens would scarcely think it necessary to justify the employment of it in their devotional singing at social entertainments by referring to the example of David, if it had been commonly employed in the public worship of the church. It is a point of some difficulty, but as appears to me of no great importance. I apprehend that we are as good judges of the propriety of the practice as Clemens; and that we are at least as favourably situated for knowing what was the practice of the apostles.

(Burney, p. 10.) The council of Laodicea (A. D 3 4 or 319.) forbade all to sing in the church, except the singing canons.

(Burney, p. 25.) "After the most diligent inquiry concerning the time when instrumental music had admission into the ecclesiastical services, there is reason to conclude, that before the reign of Constantine, as the converts to the Christian religion were subject to frequent persecution and disturbance in their devotions, the use of instruments could hardly have been allowed, and by all that can be collected from the writings of the primitive Christians, they seem never to have been admitted."

(Burney, p. 26.) Eusebius (who died A. D. 340) states in his commentary on the 92d psalm, that the Christians when they meet, sing to the name of the Lord, not only with the voice, but upon an instrument of ten strings, and upon the cithera. (P. 27.) The harp and psaltery, *as being the most grave and majestic instruments of the time*, were preferred to all others.

(Burney, p 25.) The music of the first five or six ages of the church, consisted in a plain and simple chant of unisons and octaves. *Music in parts was not introduced for many ages after the establishment of Christianity.*

Bingham (Works, vol. i. p. 665.) says, "that the most ancient and general practice, till the way of alternate psalmody was brought into the church was *for the whole assembly to join together*, the women and children, united with one mouth and one mind, in singing psalms and praises to God:" but he gives little or no proof of his assertion. The writers of the Romish church say that this custom was not in use before Ambrose (who died 397); and Bingham thinks it necessary to assert the contrary; but his proof amounts to nothing. Chrysostom, indeed, (who however lived after Ambrose,) says, when comparing the times of the apostles with his own, "they all sang in common" (επεψαλον παντες κοινη); but this can prove nothing (even if C. can fairly be adduced as an evidence,) as to the practice of the age succeeding the apostolic. The fact appears to me to be, that the earliest singing in public worship among the primitive Christians was strictly speaking solo singing; that the next step was for the people at large to join in the last verse (which method we are certain continued to be practised in the 4th century); and that though at first any one who was able and willing sang these solos, by degrees the singing was confined to persons regularly appointed to undertake it. In the third century the plan of singing in alternate choirs was introduced at Antioch, and soon found its way into the West. I am not aware that any clear instance of what may be properly called congregational singing can be adduced before the fourth century. This was the last and best stage of the progress.

(Bingham, p. 669.) A mode of worship so likely to be abused (and I may add so often abused) as public singing, must frequently have afforded to the pious fathers room for doubt as to its expediency, and displeasure on account of supposed innovations. They complained of the theatrical nature of the airs, the too great nicety of the singing, &c.; and "Isidore of Pelusium (at the beginning of the 5th century,) brings the charge of these abuses more especially against women; and goes so far as to say, that though the apostle" (I do not know where.) "had allowed them to sing in the church, yet the perverse and licentious use they made of this liberty was a sufficient reason why they should be totally debarred from it."

(Bingham, p. 118.) "From the first and apostolic age, *singing was always a part of divine service*, in which the whole body of the church joined together; which is a thing so evident, that though Cabassutius denies it, and in his spite to the reformed churches, where it is generally practised, calls it only a protestant whim, yet Cardinal Bona (Rerum Liturg. lib. I. c. xxv. 19. It. de Div. Psalm, c. xvii.) has more than once not only confessed, but solidly proved it to have been the primitive practice." If the Cardinal's proofs are not stronger than the Protestant's, they are worth nothing. Bingham's sweeping assertion at the beginning shews that his statements are not to be received without examination. (See § 3. p. 463.)

I propose to conclude this long protracted discussion (and I hope briefly) in another letter; in which it is my intention to consider the grounds of the employment of music, vocal and instrumental, in public worship, and to examine the objections which are urged against the latter in particular.

I am, Sir,
Yours sincerely,
L. C.

REVIEW.

"Still pleas'd to praise, yet not afraid to blame.—POPE.

ART. I. *A Course of Lectures, containing a Description and Systematic Arrangement of the several Branches of Divinity*: accompanied with an Account both of the principal Authors, and of the Progress, which has been made at different Periods, in Theological Learning. By Herbert Marsh, D. D. F. R. S. Margaret Professor of Divinity. Part III. On the Interpretation of the Bible. Cambridge, printed: Sold in London by Rivingtons. 1813. 8vo. pp. 117.

After an interval of three* years, we are happy to perceive that the Margaret Professor resumes those official and literary labours by which he at once maintains his own reputation, and assists the progress of others in the most important of all the sciences. In speaking of this third part* of his Lectures, the language which we shall employ, will be, with little reserve, that of commendation. We should have been better pleased had Dr. Marsh made no references to the controversy in which he is engaged respecting the Bible Society, and had he spared one or two undignified allusions to the danger, real or supposed, of the established church.† These however are trifling blemishes in a work of so much excellence: nor have they prevented us from warmly admiring the solid and vigorous judgment, the correct and extensive information, the perspicuous style and method which generally characterize the pamphlet.

---

* Mon. Rep. Vol. V. and VI.

The thirteenth lecture points out the relation which the interpretation of the Bible bears to the criticism of it, states the nature and the causes of the difficulty of biblical interpretation, and, professing to correct some erroneous notions on this matter, represents the sense in which scripture is its own interpreter, is clear and satisfactory, and sufficient for salvation.

In the fourteenth the professor treats of words, regarded as signs to the reader of what was thought by the writer: he considers the kind and degree of difficulty attending the discovery of the original meaning of them; and he directs us to the sources of intelligence in respect of the words of the Hebrew Bible and the Greek Testament, v. g. the Chaldee, Syriac and Arabic versions, the Septuagint translation and the Latin Vulgate. A few observations are added upon " our own authorized version," to the revision of which this lecturer is a friend, and on the necessity of interpreting from the original scriptures.

Rules are laid down in the fifteenth lecture for the interpretation of words. In the first place, we must inquire what notion is [or was] affixed to any word, under our review, by the persons in general who speak [or spake] the language? Further, 2dly, We must ascertain what was the particular application of such words, by attention to the particular situation of the persons to whom they were immediately addressed. Thirdly, The words of an author must be so explained as not to make them inconsistent with his known character, his known sentiments, his known situation and the known circumstances of the subject on which he wrote. The consequences of neglecting these rules, are delineated with great force and correctness: an excellent comparison is instituted between the interpreter who explains the Bible by the aid of reason and learning and the interpreter who aspires to the possession of higher means, and claims to be inspired. It is attempted to prove that there is an important practical difference between the terms *does not err* and *cannot err:* and some valuable remarks are subjoined on the necessity of theological learning and the causes of its neglect.

The general heads of the sixteenth lecture are—Of the literal and figurative use of words; and of the *foundation* of this distinction in the origin and formation of language.—Consequences of interpreting words *literally*, when they are used *figuratively*.—Necessity of arranging the words in genealogical order. Most of Dr. Marsh's illustrations and observations, in discussing these topics, bespeak the accurate philosopher, scholar and divine.

---

* Meaning here the " portion of lectures given and published at the *same period.*"

† Pp. 77, &c.

Of lecture the seventeenth the main subject is *allegory*. The relation which it has to *metaphor*, is largely explained and very well illustrated. Merited censures are passed on the practice of interpreting the scriptures allegorically. It is proved that this custom can derive no support from the language of Paul in Gal. iv. 24: its origin and progress are traced; and the evil of it as aiding the cause of infidelity, is powerfully exposed.

In the last lecture this topic is pursued at some length. Here, again, we meet with an excellent specimen of scripture criticism—on 2 Cor. iii. 6. From allegorical the Professor advances to treat of typical interpretation. This, he observes, is warranted to a certain extent by the sacred writers themselves: "and," he adds, "if we transgress the limits, which *they* have prescribed, we shall be in perpetual danger of taking things for what they were not *designed* to be." Having adduced a striking example of the abuse which may be made of this kind of interpretation, he concludes the third part of his lectures by announcing his purpose of next directing the attention of his auditors and readers to the interpretation of prophecy. On a subject so important, yet so curious and so difficult, we shall be particularly happy in receiving instruction from such a teacher.

We shall now apply ourselves to the agreeable, yet, within our limits, not very easy, task of selecting a few passages from this pamphlet.

The following remark of Dr. Marsh's, in recommendation of Biblical criticism, are intrinsically valuable, and not a little pertinent to the present condition and estimate of the study of divinity: (3)

> "The Bible must be examined by the same laws of criticism which are applied to other writings of antiquity: and every man, who is set apart for the ministry, should consider it as his bounden duty to study with especial care that *primary* branch of theology, the criticism of the Bible. It is a branch, which gives nutriment and life to all the other branches: and *these* will become more or less vigorous, in proportion as *that* branch either flourishes or decays. By cultivating the criticism of the Bible, we acquire a habit of calm and impartial investigation, which will enable us to enter with greater advantage on the other departments of theology; we learn to discriminate between objects apparently alike, but really distinct; we learn to sharpen our judgments and correct our imaginations; we learn to think for ourselves without blindly trusting to bare assertion, which may deceive, but can never convince; and, while we fortify our faith against the shafts of infidelity, we become proof against the seductions of ignorance and fanaticism. Such are the advantages resulting to an *interpreter* of the Bible from a previous acquaintance with the *criticism* of the Bible; advantages unknown to the mere theological empiric, who regards them as useless for no other reason than because he has never learnt to comprehend them."

We shall next lay before our readers the sentiments of the Margaret Professor on *our authorized version*. He says (35),

> "—When we consider the immense accession which has been made (since the age of James the First), both to our critical and to to our philological

apparatus; when we consider, that the whole mass of literature, commencing with the London Polyglot, and continued to Griesbach's Greek Testament was collected *subsequently* to that period; when we consider that the most important sources of intelligence for the *interpretation* of the original scriptures were *likewise* opened after that period, we cannot possibly pretend that our authorized version does not require *amendment*."

Reasoning in the same accurate and conclusive manner, he appeals to a notorious fact (41.):

"—we know, that the English version, which had been authorized by Queen Elizabeth was exchanged for *another* version authorized by James the First. We have therefore a precedent in our own church, for following the advice of Archbishop Newcome,* and *again* revising by authority our English version."

We would fain persuade ourselves that these intimations will not be lost on our author's ecclesiastical superiors. A revision and improvement of the received version of the scriptures, would be a most happy consequence of Dr Marsh's Lectures, and a valuable collateral effect of the discussions carrying on between biblists and anti-biblists.

Although there is little, if any, novelty, yet there is much strength in this writer's observation on the scope of the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians (49):

"The question *there* decided is very different from any question which now agitates the religious world for no man would *now* suppose, that the best Christians are they who have been Jews. Yet how seldom do we find an interpreter of St. Paul, who keeps in view the subject and circumstances of *that* controversy on which St. Paul himself was writing. Men interpret his Epistles, as if he were a writer of the *present* age and passages relating solely to the question at issue between *Jewish* and *Heathen* converts, are so explained, as if the apostle had been sitting in judgment, to decide between *Calvin* and *Arminius*."

Let us be indulged in one more quotation: it regards a topic which has often occupied our thoughts and is deeply interesting to our feelings (56, &c.).

"—As soon as men have persuaded themselves that in points of doctrine they *cannot* err they will think it an imperious *duty* to prevent the growth of all *other* opinions on a subject so important as *religion*. Should argument therefore fail, the importance of the *end* will be supposed to justify the worst of means. But the intolerance, thus produced by an imaginary exemption from error, is far from being confined to the church of *Rome*. The same intolerance is produced in every man who imagines that he interprets the scriptures under the especial guidance of the Holy Spirit. It makes no difference, in this respect, whether such especial guidance is supposed to be vouchsafed to a *general council* or to an *individual in his private apartment*. The result in either case is the same. In either case, the persons who believe themselves so *gifted*, will conclude, that they *cannot* err In either case they will deem it impious to tolerate what the spirit, as *they* imagine, has condemned. And hence we may justly infer, that the same inquisitorial power, which has been exercised by the church of Rome, would be exercised by *others*, who set up similar pretensions, if the means of employing that power were once at their command."

This statement, we fear, is more than speculatively true: we dread any claim, whether avowed or implied, to theological infallibility, by whomever it be made.

We cannot acquiesce in Dr. M's. opinion as to the expediency of confessions of faith (19, 20). History and observation teach us that they fail of answering any rational or worthy end; they are a snare to the weak, a cover for the indolent and a serious embarrassment to generous and inquiring minds.

---

* To whose Historical View of the English Biblical Translations, &c. Professor Marsh had referred in page 35.

For the most part, we agree with him in what he says of types and typical interpretation (112, &c.) Yet we doubt whether his definition of a type, as an intended—a divinely intended—resemblance of something future, be really sanctioned by a single passage of the scriptures.

If his views of this subject be correct, types are of the nature of prophecies; and we may therefore expect that they will be more largely and satisfactorily considered in some of the Professor's succeeding lectures. We would earnestly hope that no engagements, of a different description, may long detain him from the duties of his office: but we, at the same time, wish that he might even yet find leisure for again appearing in the character under which he is known to the public most honourably and most usefully—as THE ANNOTATOR ON MICHAELIS!

ART. II. *Essays on the Language of Scripture;* with Additions and Corrections. In two volumes. By John Simpson. Bath, printed. Sold in London, by Egerton, and by Johnson and Co. 1812. 8vo. Vol. i. pp. 496. Vol. ii. pp. 380.

(Continued from p. 609.)

We have already perceived how Mr. Simpson reasons, and what he thinks, concerning the duration of the future punishment of the wicked: and if there are those who pronounce his opinion upon this subject heretical and antiscriptural, he shares the reproach together with the late Dr. Hartley and Bishop Newton; not to mention other celebrated and estimable names. But the inquiries of the learned essayist appear more valuable as they rectify some hasty statements or erroneous arguments of his contemporaries and predecessors than as they establish any positive deduction. For instance, we cordially agree with him that the mere use of the terms *αιων* and *αιωνιος*, determines nothing on the one side or the other (17); if they sometimes import unlimited, they as frequently describe limited* existence; and the meaning of them must usually be decided by the context.

Of a great evil spirit, the perpetual, inveterate enemy of God and man, we can *know* nothing but from the evidence of sense or from that of revelation. To the former no one will appeal, who is in possession of his faculties. The question must therefore be tried by the standard of the scriptures; and Mr. Simpson's second Essay, which is an attempt to explain those expressions in the Old and New Testament that are supposed to bear upon the subject, will be eagerly read by men who have a taste for these investigations. But persons of this class, will, probably, not be the last to lament

---

[*] Two examples of the acceptation of the word *αιων* in Sect. 59 of Demosthenes de coronâ, may not be undeserving of notice: *τȣ μελλοντος αιωνος* evidently signifies there *the next age or posterity;* and *παντα τον αιωνα* denotes *all past time as well as the present.* The *serviet æternum* of Horace (Epist. I. x. 41), will occur to the classical reader; it may illustrate 1 Cor. viii. 13.

that he has discussed the topic, in some measure, though at no great length, with references to natural religion, and has considered what proofs reason affords of the existence of such a being.

Mr. S. argues that the common notions of *the devil* or *satan,* are contradictory to natural and revealed religion, and inconsistent with each other, and that the meaning of the words under his review, is, in scripture itself, pointed out to be *adversary.* His rules of intepretation are abstractedly good; yet some of them seem to be framed with a specific view to the purpose of this essay.

Among the contradictions of the popular notions of the evil spirit to the language of scripture, the following is entitled to particular regard (106).

> "It is generally imagined," observes our author, "that the devil will be the inflicter of the future punishment of the wicked. Yet Christ says to the wicked, Matt. xxv. 41, "Go into the fire for the age prepared for the devil and his angels;" that is, for *their* punishment, if it be taken literally. Is it probable, then, that the devil will be the punisher of others? On the contrary Jesus tell us that *his angels* shall inflict that future punishment on the wicked Matt. xiii. 39 to 42; to which he himself will sentence and condemn them. He repeats this, Matt. xiii. 49, 50."

Whether the two last of the three texts cited by Mr. Simpson, be not appropriated to the destruction of Jerusalem, is at least doubtful; if *that* be the event to which they refer, the Roman armies were the predicted *angels*, or mesengers, of the Son of man.

The writer of these Essays subjoins to his quotation of 1 Cor. vii. 5* [lest *Satan* tempt you on account of *your incontinence*] the sentence, "Incontinence, unruly passion, is pointed out as the tempter." Now, surely, the apostle himself has discriminated, in the clearest manner, between *Satan* and *incontinence!* We take the signification of the passage to be, 'there is danger lest, by reason of your want of self-controul, the tempter (whether a supernatural or a human adversary) gain a readier and greater advantage over you.'

Upon Zechar. iii. 2. "And the Lord said unto Satan, the Lord rebuke thee, O Satan," Mr. Simpson† produces the reasoning of *Barker*,‡ who looks upon the scene there recorded as a prophetic vision. The essayist does not seem to have been aware that Blayney,‡ a more unexceptionable authority, held the same opinion; he delivers it as the most probable sentiment, that "by Satan, or the adversary, is here meant the adversaries of the Jewish nation in a body, or perhaps some leading person among them, Sanballat for instance, who strenuously opposed the rebuilding of the temple, and of course the restoration of the service of the sanctuary, and the re-establishment of Joshua in the exercise of his sacerdotal ministry."

The phrase *delivered to Satan*, does not necessarily mean *delivered to bodily disease.*¶ We acquiesce in the reasoning of a cor-

---

[*] P. 113. † 125.

‡ In his *Inquiry into the Scripture meaning of the word Satan, &c.*

§ Translation of Zech. Not. in loc.

¶ 113, 132.

respondent,* on 1 Cor. v. 3: The key to that passage, and to 1 Tim. i. 20. (132), is Acts xxvi. 18. If *to turn men from the power of Satan unto God*, consists in bringing them within the Christian church, to *deliver them* over, from God, *to Satan*, is to eject them from that church, either for a time or permanently. In other words, it is *excommunication*; it is to disclaim religious fellowship with the offending party and to treat him "as an heathen man and a publican." Matt. xviii. 17.

Our readers will not wonder that Mr. Simpson views the third chapter of Genesis as an allegorical narrative: in his explanation of it they will meet with many pertinent and instructive observations. Admitting, however, what is most probable, that "Moses collected the historical part of the Pentateuch from several books" (166), we see not how it follows that "this account of our first parents, being in the earliest part of the history, would, *of course*, be figurative." The fact of its supreme antiquity, might not prevent it from being literally true: and as such it has been interpreted with great ingenuity, though, we conceive, not with complete success, by Dr. Lardner.†

According to Mr. S. (201), the connexion of Rom. v. 12—19, in which the apostle uses ει γαρ, *for if*, in ver. 15 and 17, "is expressive of indecision" upon the point of all men dying on account of the sin of their first parent. This formulary of argument, is very familiar to Paul, especially in the present epistle: and, though it frequently introduces a *conditional* proposition, in a number of instances it stands at the head of declarations of acknowledged facts or truths; as in Rom. v. 16. vi. 5. xi. 15, 21, 24. xv. 27. Therefore it is not *necessarily* "expressive of indecision."

Commenting upon John xiv. 30 (222), our author interprets *the prince of this world* as meant "of the rulers of that part of the world, who came in the person of their emissaries that very evening, headed by Judas, to take Jesus, and to bring him before them in their judicial capacity." To this interpretation we cordially subscribe. It must be extended to John xii. 31, which a correspondent in the *Monthly Repository*,‡ understands, after Wakefield, of Jesus himself: the 6th and 8th verses of the second chapter of the former of the epistles to the Corinthians, are almost equally decisive against *this* exposition of the words. To the same effect, perhaps, is Coloss. ii. 15.

After an examination of numerous passages and a statement and consideration of objections, Mr. S. is of opinion (159) that scripture affords no proof of "the proper personality, or real existence of such a being as Satan, or the Devil, is generally supposed to be." He says, in conclusion, (237) "The notion that any adversary to piety and virtue, or that any cruel and malicious being, will be employed to execute the awful denunciations of God against sinners in the future world, is directly contrary to the express declarations of Jesus." While he admits that, from the manner in which the words *σαταν*, *διαϐολος*, *κ. τ. λ.* are used, a general belief of the actual existence of an evil spirit evidently seems to have prevailed, he understands all these terms figuratively, "of an allegorical person, not a real one."

---

* M. Rep. Vol. V. 555.

† Works, Vol. xi. 227—253.

‡ Vol. vii. 175.

Notwithstanding the care and labour which he has bestowed upon the subject, it is still involved, we think, in some obscurity: and although, we are persuaded that *diabolical agency* does not form an article of *revelation*, we want the same conviction of its having been disbelieved by our Lord and his apostles which we possess of their having taught the doctrines of pardon and immortality.*

The title of this writer's third essay is, in substance, "a view of the different significations of two words in the Old Testament and of one in the New Testament which, in our English bibles, are rendered *heaven*." In distinct sections he assigns the several meanings of the term, as follow; the air or atmosphere, in which are the clouds; the expanse beyond the atmosphere, in which are the sun, the moon and stars; the atmosphere and the whole visible universe beyond it; the supposed peculiar residence of God, and of angels, beyond the visible expanse; a cloud and fire on Mount Sinai; GOD; the inhabitants of heaven, or a personification of the firmament; the Jewish nation. In other sections he points out the signification of the term *heaven*, *heavens*, with different combinations. Of the inferences which he deduces from the whole view the most important is that in the scriptures, "the *place* in which the righteous shall dwell after their resurrection, is never spoken of." (304)

We confess that we occasionally differ from Mr. S. respecting the arrangement of some of the texts which he has enumerated in this essay. With his characteristic modesty, he intimates (299) the possibility of such a difference of opinion. Nor are we certain that he has not needlessly added to the number of his sections. On the whole, this like every part of his communications, will materially assist students in the scriptures, at the same time that it reflects credit on the industry and talents of the author.

The fourth essay is an inquiry into the meaning of those words in the Old and New Testament which are equivalent with the English terms *angel*, *archangel*, &c.: and into the nature of intelligent angels. It is learned and often judicious and satisfactory. But the chief distinction of it is the author's endeavour to shew that intelligent angels or messengers of God are human beings (393, &c.) who have departed out of this life. This point he argues from considerations to which we shall soon advert. And he then discusses, but, in our humble judgment, does not refute, the objections to his position. If an angel appeared *in the form of a man*, this would be a sufficient reason for the term *man* being sometimes applied to him: and, though it is granted that some human beings have appeared to men, after their departure from this life, as divine messengers, a general and important doctrine, nevertheless, must not be erected upon a few solitary instances. What advantage, too, we ask, would be obtained by the establishment of Mr. Simpson's hypothesis? On either supposition, the communications first referred to, must have been *miraculous*. Let our readers then say if it be more likely that these communications were made by the medium of men *after their departure from this life* than by that of beings who rank higher than ourselves in the scale of existence? Besides, Samuel, Moses and Elijah are never called *angels* (416).

---

* A Jew would learn from the beginning of the book of Job that *Satan* could not act without God's permission and controul: nor would even a divine commission exempt of necessity, those invested with it, from certain ancient errors.

We are much happier when we can agree with this meritorious writer than in expressing our dissent from any of his conclusions. On Ps. lxxviii. 25, [Man did eat *angels'* food] he criticises very accurately by simply producing the Hebrew word; and he well renders the clause *the bread of the mighty* (365). Rosenmüller and Geddes might have been quoted in behalf of the correction.

There are many other remarks in this essay which claim our approbation; while there are some in which we cannot acquiesce. But, altogether, we earnestly recommend it to the notice of theological students and inquirers. On the subject of angels, as on that of an evil spirit (and both arise out of the language of the records of revealed religion, instead of being parts of revealed religion), further light will perhaps be known by a continued investigation of scriptural phraseology.

Mr. Simpson has done much towards this object. His memory is not dishonoured when we add that, aided by his services, future critics may possibly do more. In both the cases which we have mentioned, it appears to ourselves that the parties who write or speak of them in the Old and the New Testament, were convinced of the real, personal existence of these descriptions of beings. Even if they frequently employ the terms in question allegorically, such an application of them seems to denote that this was not their primary meaning, but that the figurative must have been erected on a literal signification.

In the fifth essay, which is not very happily placed, Mr. Simpson examines into the meaning of John vi. 62, 63, and of Exodus vi. 3. The former of these passages [What and if ye shall see the Son of man, &c.] he thus points and translates (349), "*Nevertheless*, when ye shall see the Son of man *rise up* where he was before, YE WILL KNOW THAT* *he* is the spirit that giveth life." His paraphrase is as follows: "when ye shall perceive that the Son of man is risen from the dead to life again, ye will know that he shall have power to give everlasting life to those who believe in and obey him." The other text [I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob by the *name* of God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them] our author renders and interprets in this manner: "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by *the name* of God Almighty; but by my name (*or title*) Jehovah I was not known (*or distinguished*, *or distinguishingly manifested*) to them." 'That is, when I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, I did not then appropriate the name *Jehovah* as my *distinctive* title from false gods and as the God of my people; but I appropriated the appellation *God Almighty* to these purposes, under the *Abrahamic* dispensation' (455).

---

* These words Mr. S. supplies by *conjecture*.

We acknowledge ourselves not a little pleased with these specimens of the writer's critical skill and ingenuity. At the same time, we regard John i. 18, iii. 13. as disclosing the sense of vi. 62.

The sixth essay, which should have preceded all the others, is an excellent sketch of the different modes in which the Hebrews express a great degree and the superlative degree of a quality. Here Mr. S. treads, for the most part, on stable ground: and, his subject being now a peculiarity, grammatical and rhetorical, of language, this application of his learning and judgment, will be satisfactory to nearly all his readers. For the sections into which this useful paper is divided, we refer to the essay itself: a few remarks which occurred to us during the perusal of it, shall be put down in their order.

Our Essayist (465) interprets Is. liii. 4, [smitten of God] as importing *greatly afflicted*. The accuracy of the interpretation, is dubious: for the prophet's meaning seems to be that the Jews of our Saviour's age, would look upon his sufferings as a judicial punishment, inflicted upon him *by God*, for his blasphemy and imposture.

466. In Mark xi. 22, *πιςτιν ϑεȣ* may signify *the faith which has God for its object.*

To the examples under Section xi (476) may be added Matt. xv. 4. [*ϑανατῳ τελευτατω*]. In its general form, it is a Hebraism: and Newcome has well rendered it, "let him surely die."

(486.) We doubt as to Mr. Simpson's explanation of Gen. xii. 2. [Thou shalt be a blessing—i. e. *very blessed*] He considers it as an instance of an abstract substantive being used to denote a high degree. We submit that the genuine meaning of the word in this passage, is fixed by Gen. xviii. 18, and that Abraham here receives a promise of his being made *a blessing* to his posterity and to mankind. But, in the room of the above text, we shall place under this section Ezek. ii. 7, for the literal translation of which the reader may consult the margin of the English Bible.

491, 492. In the catalogue of texts under Sect. xxiii. we should class Num. xxvii. 21. and all those passages where the memorable words URIM and THUMMIN are found. The judgment so denominated, was, according to Dr. Samuel Chandler,* the judgment or determination "of LIGHTS and PERFECTIONS, i. e." says he, "perfectly clear, precise and full; the plural number being frequently used, in the oriental languages, to denote the excellency and perfection of any thing."

---

* Life of David, Vol. i. 8.

Art. III. *Dr. Watts no Socinian.* A Refutation of the Testimony of Dr. Lardner, as brought forward in the Rev. T. Belsham's Memoirs of the late Rev. Theophilus Lindsey, "That Dr. Watts's last sentiments were completely Unitarian." In a Series of Letters to the Rev. Joseph Smith, of Manchester. By Samuel Palmer. 8vo. 1s. 6d. Conder. 1813.

This is a piece of greater promise than performance. To the unequivocal testimony of Dr. Lardner, [see the present Vol. p. 532, &c.] Mr. Palmer opposes only presumptions, and those not always weighty. It is necessary to the support of Mr. Palmer's hypothesis that he should make good the charge of "imbecility," which he rather unexpectedly retorts upon Dr. Lardner. The fact seems to be undisputed that Dr. Watts was at the last no Trinitarian, in the common acceptation of that term; but to what degree he departed from the standard of orthodoxy cannot be ascertained. Dr. Lardner might think that he went farther than he actually did, though we cannot lightly esteem Lardner's judgment. The extracts from Watts's last printed works on which Mr. Palmer chiefly rests his "Refutation," are scarcely to the purpose; for passages sounding quite as orthodox might, we believe, be quoted from the works of the older acknowledged "Socinians." To us it appears probable that Dr. Watts intended to bring out his "new thoughts" by degrees; that his last printed works were written some time before their publication, and did not express his last opinions; and that the unpublished, destroyed M.SS. of the Doctor's, *some of which Laraner says he had seen*, did shew him to have become COMPLETELY UNITARIAN.

By the term *Unitarian*, however, Dr. Lardner probably meant only an anti-Trinitarian, who at the same time was not an Arian. There is "ambiguity" in the term; but is there less in that of "Socinian," which Mr. Palmer adopts? A "Socinian" is surely one who holds the faith of Socinus, with regard to Jesus Christ, which the modern Unitarian does not hold, which Mr. Lindsey has called *idolatrous*. The "indwelling scheme," which Mr. Palmer appears to favour, is, in our judgment, nearer to Socinianism than any other scheme now professed. Why then does Mr. P., at the very time that he objects to the term *Unitarian*, so largely use another which is equally objectionable, to say the least, and which he knows is offensive to the persons to whom it is applied! Except, indeed, in this case of Mr. Palmer, we scarcely know an instance of a modern writer using the disowned appellation — *Socinian*—with any other view than that of reproach.

Unitarian is not the only ambiguous term in theology: *atonement*, *human depravity*, *divine influences*, and similar expressions, from which Mr. Palmer infers Dr. Watts's *orthodoxy*, are quite as equivocal: and we fancy we have known divines who by the copious use of them in public have obtained a reputation for "soundness," while in reality they have held none of the doctrines couched under these heads in the usually accepted sense of the popular creeds, confessions and catechisms.

INTELLIGENCE.

The Epistle from the Yearly Meeting, held in London, by Adjournments, from the 19th of the Fifth Month, to the 29th of the same, inclusive, 1813, to the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings of Friends, in Great Britain, Ireland, and elsewhere.

DEAR FRIENDS,

We have had cause, at this time, to acknowledge the condescension of our Heavenly Father, who is still pleased to own with his presence these our annual assemblies. Under this influence, our hearts have been united; and we have been animated to crave the assistance of his Holy Spirit, that we may be enabled to serve him with faithfulness, and to uphold with Christian simplicity our various religious testimonies. And we believe that the constraining love of the gospel calls upon us to salute our dear brethren with the invitation, "O! taste and see that the Lord is good."—Ps. xxxiv. 8

In the course of the usual proceedings of this meeting, we have received from the several quarterly and other meetings of which it is constituted an account of the state of our religious society. Whilst we lament that many amongst us are still too much engrossed with the fading enjoyments of this life, and are refusing to follow our holy Pattern in the path of self-denial, we wish they may not be deprived of that encouragement to turn into the right way which often results from the faithful admonitions of those who have known the benefits of greater circumspection. Though, from a sense of their own weakness, some of the rightly concerned among us may be ready to shrink from the performance of this duty, we would remind them, that by thus evincing their love to their friends, they will receive additional strength themselves; and that such acts of dedication will contribute to their own advancement in the Christian course.

We desire, dear friends, that such of you as often meet in small companies for the solemn purpose of worship, may not relax in your diligence. Your situation will at times appear discouraging; but although you may be seldom assisted by the company and travail of your brethren, never forget that you are under the continued notice of the Lord; and that his tender regard extends to all those who wait upon him in reverence and humility. Many who have been alike circumstanced, can acknowledge that they have known their strength renewed, and their confidence in divine support increased, by a due attendance of their meetings for religious worship. Your situation, though trying to yourselves, is important. If with faithfulness and integrity you perform your Christian duties, your example will prevail with others who have been too negligent of the concerns of a future life; and by your consistent conduct the truth which we profess will be exalted—the name of the Lord glorified.

Our minds have been affected, at this time, by the recent decease of many with whom we have been associated in religious labour, and whose memory is precious. We feel the loss of these; yet we can with thankfulness acknowledge, we have been comforted in reflecting, that the Almighty Power which was their support, and which has preserved us since we were first gathered to be a people, is unchangeably the same. We sympathise also with those who are in the decline of life, in whose hearts such afflictive deprivations may, in their solicitude for the welfare of the church, excite many discouraging feelings. To you, our elder brethren and sisters, we offer the salutation of our cordial love. We desire that you may partake of our comfort, in observing the conduct of many, who are now in the vigour of health and strength, and who, in various ways, are giving proofs of their attachment to that cause, the prosperity of which has been your greatest joy. We doubt not that your endeavours to stand approved in the sight of God, have met his gracious acceptance, and that your example and labours in the Lord's service, have animated many of these your younger brethren to follow you, as you have been endeavouring to follow Christ. Let us likewise entreat you, dear friends, who are of less religious experience, but who have entered upon the active scenes of life, not to retard your Christian progress, by any unwillingness to make an entire surrender of your hearts to the disposal of Infinite Wisdom. The Lord is a rich rewarder of all his faithful followers; and happy will it be for you, should you be permitted to see many days, to reflect, at the close of life, that you have been devoted to the promotion of his cause.

The amount of sufferings brought in this year, is upwards of fifteen thousand four hundred and seventy pounds; a small proportion of this sum has been taken for military purposes: but the greater part was incurred in the support of our ancient Christian testimony against tithes and other demands of an ecclesiastical nature.

We have received an epistle from our friends in Ireland, and one from each of the Yearly Meeting on the Continent of America except that of Carolina. In consequence of large emigrations from other parts of the United States, five quarterly meetings of friends resident on the Western side of the Allegany mountains have been detached from the Yearly Meeting of Maryland, and formed into a separate one. Under the influence of that love by which we are united as brethren, we have addressed an epistle to those who are intending to meet on that important occasion, in the eighth month next, in the State of Ohio. From the epistles and other communications from America, we find that our friends, besides being attentive to the concerns of our own Society, are still pursuing their engagements for the welfare of the African and the Indian race. But the war in which that country and this are now sorrowfully involved, has presented great obstacles to their efforts towards civilizing the Indians; and is likely, for a time, to suspend in some parts their successful exertions in that important and interesting cause.

When we consider the continuance and extension of war, we cannot but deeply feel, on account of the desolations and numerous evils which are its inseparable attendants: and we earnestly intreat all our members, so to abide within the limitations of truth, as in no degree to violate our Christian testimony in this respect for the sake of gain. Let us keep out of even the spirit of contest; and strive for the attainment of a dependance upon Him, whose kingdom is not of this world.

Amongst the numerous benevolent undertakings which now interest the minds of our countrymen, we contemplate, with much satisfaction, the general circulation of the Holy Scriptures. Our sense of that inestimable treasure has been frequently acknowledged; and we feel ourselves engaged to call the attention of such of our members as may be employed in this salutary work, to the supreme importance of giving heed to that Divine Word, to which the scriptures bear testimony. This Word is Christ; the "Bread of Life," and the "Light of men;" that "Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." If we are earnest to obey the teachings of this unerring guide, we shall be led to cry to the Lord, that he would preserve us from self exaltation, from attributing to ourselves or others that honour which is due to him alone. We should be on our guard lest we should mistake our proper sphere of usefulness, or suffer any pursuit, however laudable in itself, to divert us from our true allotment of labour in the church. This watchfulness unto prayer can alone ensure our growth in religious experience, and our establishment in every good word and work.

"Finally, brethren, Farewell! Be perfect." Let this attainment be the principal object in view: then will you be of good comfort, and of one mind; you will live in peace one with another, and "the God of love and peace" will be with you.

Signed in and on behalf of the Meeting, by JOHN WILKINSON,
Clerk to the Meeting this Year.

Letter from the Unitarian Dissenters, Plymouth, to Mr. Wm. Smith.

To William Smith, Esq.

Sir,

The congregation of Unitarian dissenters, meeting at Plymouth, find themselves called upon by a sense of obligation to address you in a letter of thanks for the service which they conceive you have rendered the cause of freedom and of truth by obtaining the repeal of the Penal Laws which were in force against the description of worshippers to which they belong.

We scarcely know whether we have

most reason to congratulate you, Sir, to whose mind the victory you have gained over the bigotry and the ignorance of our ancestors must furnish a most gratifying reflection; or ourselves, on the encouragement which fair discussion and an honest declaration of truth have received; or the great body of professing Christians, who owe to you a spiritual blessing whose value time cannot destroy: but we are sure that we ought to congratulate our country and our government, because, through your agency, a blot has been wiped off our national character, and a public act of our legislature has declared that it is the duty of every Christian to search the scriptures, to enquire for himself, and to avow the result, whatever it may be, of his serious enquiry after "the truth as it is in Jesus."

Though your late successful attempt to promote the interests of true religion demands our especial thanks, because you have removed out of our path that "fear of man which bringeth a snare," even to serious and upright minds; we beg, sir, also to acknowledge the repeated obligations under which we have lain to you, as well in the character of Chairman to the Committee of the Three Denominations, as of the enlightened and the steady friend of Civil and Religious Liberty in the House of Commons—and we pray the Almighty to recompence you with what will be to you the sweetest reward, the conviction that as a man and a Christian you have done your duty.

Signed by the Minister and Members
of the Unitarian Congregation,
Plymouth.

Manchester Quarterly Meeting.

The autmnal Quarterly Meeting of Ministers, generally denominated Presbyterian, in Manchester and its vicinity, was held at Plat, near Manchester, at the chapel of the Rev. Mr. Whitelegg. The Rev. J. Holland introduced the service, *vice* the Rev. J. Bealey, whose recent death is a subject of deep regret in this neighbourhood; and the Rev. Mr. Aspland preached from 2 Cor. x. 7. The meeting was gratified to hear that Mr Aspland intends to publish the sermon. About twenty ministers and thirty lay gentlemen returned to Manchester to dinner, and spent the afternoon in a manner suitable to the objects of the association, and highly gratifying to the gentlemen present. Among other appropriate sentiments, the health of Wm. Smith, Esq. M. P. for Norwich, was drunk, and the following resolution unanimously passed:

Resolved, That the thanks of this Association, consisting both of ministers and laymen, in the neighbourhood of Manchester, be given to Wm. Smith, Esq. one of the representatives in parliament for the city of Norwich, for his unwearied and successful exertions in procuring the repeal of the several statutes directed against those who impugn the doctrine of the *Trinity*, and for the encouragement which his success affords us to hope, that the time is not far distant, when, all penal laws in reference to religious opinions being abolished, the word toleration and the spirit of intolerance shall become equally obsolete.

The Christmas quarterly meeting will be held at the Unitarian chapel in Mosely Street, Manchester. Mr. Robberds will introduce the service, and Mr. Allard will be the preacher.

W. J.

Oldbury Double Lecture.

On Tuesday, Sept. 14, 1813, was holden at Oldbury, in Shropshire, the Annual Meeting of Dissenting Ministers which is distinguished by the name of "The Oldbury Double Lecture." The Rev. Timothy Davis, of Coventry, prayed. The first sermon was preached by the Rev. — Small of Coseley, from Phil. i. 27, last clause. "That ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the gospel." The second discourse, delivered by the Rev. James Hews Bransby, of Dudley was grounded on 1 Thess. ii. 13. "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but (as it is in truth) the word of God." The service, in which singing of psalms had its proportional share, was closed with prayer by the last preacher. The audience was respectable and attentive. The sermons were replete with just and liberal sentiments, clothed in strong and pointed language and adapted to the original design of the meeting, which was instituted with reference to the case of the ministers ejected by the Act of Uniformity in 1662, and gives a fit occasion to bring up to view, with a more general or direct reference to it, the principles of a Protestant dissent.

In the afternoon when twelve ministers were present, on the motion of the Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, of Stourbridge, seconded by the Rev. James Scott, of Cradley,

It was unanimously resolved, That the sincere and heartfelt thanks of this meeting be presented to William Smith, Esq. for his late successful exertion in procuring the repeal of the Laws against the impugners of the doctrine of the Trinity, and for his long-continued, well-directed zeal in favour of universal religious liberty.

The excellent Mr. Job Orton, speaking of this Anniversary of the Bartholomew sufferers, in a letter to the Rev. Samuel Palmer, says: "I persuaded some ministers whom I could be free with, when they preached this Lecture to keep in view the intention of it, and they did so, much to the pleasure and edification of the hearers'[*] The respectable gentleman to whom this was observed, and who has stamped a permanent honour on his own name by being the memorialist of those worthies, in the year 1804; being in the neighbourhood, was invited to preach at this service: and it is recollected by the writer of this, that the appropriate discourse, which Mr. Palmer delivered on the occasion, excited an interest and afforded a general and peculiar satisfaction, which verified the justness and weight of Mr. Orton's opinion on the propriety and utility of preachers, at this annual association, keeping in view the design, with which it originated. Mr. Palmer's pertinent and impressive discourse, it is apprehended, was the same that afterwards appeared from the *press*, as *prepared* to be preached, at the desire of the Committee for establishing a GENERAL UNION of the independent churches; under the title of "Bartholomew Day commemorated." From some cause, which is not explained in the preface, the delivery of it from the pulpit was prevented Many it is to be hoped, have been instructed and edified by the perusal of "the natural and sensible reflections" on the history of Paul's persecutions, of which the discourse consists.[†] T.

Oct. 18, 1813.

Ordination of the Rev. Henry Turner, at Bradford.

On Wednesday, Sept. 22, a meeting of the associated ministers of the Presbyterian denomination in the West Riding of Yorkshire, with other friends from a distance, was held at Bradford, for the purpose of recommending to the Divine blessing the connection recently entered into between the congregation (late under the pastoral care of the Rev. John Dean,) and Mr. Henry Turner, late of the Manchester College, York. The service was introduced by the Rev. Thomas Jervis, with an appropriate prayer, and the reading of the scriptures; after which Joseph Dawson, Esq. of Royds Hall, announced in the name of the congregation, the choice which they had lately made of Mr. Turner for their pastor, and, after having paid a handsome tribute to the memory of his grandfather, and adverted to his descent from, and more or less remote connection with, other eminent ministers, very delicately hinted at this among other motives, which should influence his young friend to a faithful discharge of the office which he had undertaken. As it appeared consistent with the strictest propriety, that a religious connection of this nature should commence with a public religious service, the congregation requested, on this occasion, the prayers and advices of their neighbouring friends: in which request he did not doubt that their young minister most heartily concurred; but as it was obvious, that they would comply with this request the more cordially, and unite in recommending him and his labours to the Divine blessing with greater propriety, if they were first acquainted with his views in entering on the Christian ministry, he trusted that he would not object, in signifying his concurrence, to explain these views; without, however, by any means tying himself down to any particular set of religious opinions, but maintaining for himself, as he exhorted him always to do, that liberty wherewith Christ hath made all men free.

---

[*] Letters to Dissenting Ministers. Vol. II. p. 148.

[†] See Monthly Repository, Vol. III. (for 1808,) p. 43.

Mr. Turner, in a modest but manly address, stated his cordial concurrence in the request of the congregation, explained his views in becoming a minister of Christ, expressed his full conviction of the divine original and authority of the Christian religion, his purpose to make the unbiassed examination of those scriptures which contain its history and doctrines the business of his life, and his full determination to declare without disguise the results of his enquiries and to make these results the foundation both of his public and private instructions He particularly expressed his intention to devote himself to the especial service of the young and of the poor, and concluded by repeating his earnest request for the prayers and advices of his older friends.

In compliance with this united request, the Rev John Holland of Bolton, in an animated, affectionate prayer, recommended both the congregation and their young minister to the Divine blessing.

The Rev. Charles Wellbeloved then particularly addressed to the congregation a series of important advices, by which it is sincerely hoped that other congregations may have an opportunity of profiting, as they were extremely well calculated to correct many abuses which have by degrees insinuated themselves into those societies which have assumed to themselves the name of rational. His observations upon the *half day* Christians of the present age, and the natural tendency of their practice to sap the foundations of practical Christianity, were particulary worthy of attention.

The service concluded with an address to the Minister from his Father, the Rev. William Turner of Newcastle; who took occasion, from the circumstance of his having himself stood in the same interesting situation, upwards of thirty years ago, in that immediate neighbourhood † and in the presence of some of the same persons (particularly of the worthy friend who conducted the business of this day on the part of the congregation), to refer his son to the excellent advice which he then received from *his* father, of which having given a short epitome and recommended the whole to his frequent serious attention he proceeded to enlarge on the importance of the character of a minister of Christ, and the many weighty obligations which it included, expressed his particular satisfaction in the purpose which his son had just expressed of particularly devoting his attention to the young and the poor, and concluded by expressing his hearty concurrence in the recommendation which they had lately heard of both minister and people to the Divine protection and blessing.

On the whole, the service was interesting and impressive; and it is hoped was so managed as to be kept entirely free from the objections usually made to the office of ordination as presuming to invest with a character and powers not previously possessed; being in fact nothing more than a friendly congratulation, in the presence of God, with a minister and his people on the commencement of their religious connection.

Perhaps the order would have been more natural, if the advice to the minister had immediately followed his address, that to the congregation had succeeded, and the general prayer for both minister and people had concluded the service. V. F.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

Providence has showered down its blessings upon us in a most plentiful supply of every thing, which the ground produces, and thanksgivings on this account are commanded from every congregation of the two sects established by law in the united kingdom. The act of government in this case agrees with the spontaneous thanks from every congregation of the sects not established by law; and indeed, where is the Christian, who will not rejoice, that his brethren, o-whatever sect they may be, are united at least in this act of returning thanks to the giver of all good for his undeserved bounty. In the case of thanksgivings for victories over enemies, there may be a pause in the Christian mind, a doubt whether such a service is acceptable to the Father of all, who does not see with our eyes, nor vary as we do in marking out first one, and then another, by the name of enemy. It is said as we do: for here the common language is used; but Christians have no enemies, for whose good they will not pray, for whose salvation they are not interested.

---

† At Pudsey, Sept. 25, 1782.

The great supply of wheat has not been unaccompanied however with some circumstances, which require animadversion. A great deal of unmerited obloquy has been thrown out upon a class of men, without whose aid we should be put to very great inconvenience in the preparation of our food, and the bakers have been stigmatised, as keeping up the price of bread beyond what the state of the case required. We hope that none of our readers have been led away by these idle prejudices: and we think it our duty to warn those persons particularly, who are respectable for worth and piety, from entertaining them. Such persons often from want of due consideration do great injury to their own minds and the minds of the more ignorant and less worthy. The baker comes in contact, if we may so express it, with more men than any other trade. All almost are consumers of bread: and the class therefore of those, who prepare it for us, must be very numerous. But is there any thing in the occupation of this large class, which renders it more likely to be fraudulent, to be rapacious, to be exorbitant than any other class? There is great labour and some skill requisite in carrying on the business; and, if we judge from the wealth in this compared with that of many other classes, there is no reason to imagine that their gains are by any means beyond what such labour and skill have a right to expect. How idle then, or rather how wicked it is to excite a cry against a class of men, without whom we cannot well exist,—and for which it is not, primâ facie, likely, that there should be any foundation!

But if it is not the baker, then it is the miller, and now our prejudices are excited against another class of our brethren, employed in a most useful occupation, and one in fact, which had a great effect in the destruction of slavery. It was formerly the business of the lowest slaves to grind the corn for the use of the family, and very hard labour it was; so much so that the greatest threat against a higher slave for negligence in his duty was that of sending him to the mills. Windmills were invented, and the labour of a hundred slaves was performed by machinery, and the inspection of a single man. Since that we have had water mills, and mills moved by steam, yet in spite of this experience there have been attempts to bring us back to the labour of former times, and to introduce again the handmill amongst us. Futile attempt! Wherever the handmill appears, a few days trial will settle the question: for the poor, who are to employ themselves with it free of expence, will soon find that the labour and time taken up in grinding imperfectly far outweighs the price, demanded by the miller, for returning to them a much better article. The miller like the baker has a right to a fair profit for his labour and skill, and capital employed: and, besides, he depends on the supply of water or on the wind for the exercise of his trade: and it may happen, that at the end of a most plentiful harvest, a large district may for some time have no supply from their mills from a drought and continuance of calm weather. It is the interest of the miller to grind as fast as he can, and any one may see that, when there is wind, he is not idle.

It is easy to excite clamour, and each class may find fault with its neighbour: but surely equal justice is required, and if one class is thus abused, let the others take their share also in this mutual contumely. The fact is, that all men, engaged in labour, in trade, in any exchange whatever, naturally wish to get as good a price as they can for their commodity. The landholder lets his land as high as he can; in consequence the farmer must endeavour to get as high a price as he can for his corn; the miller for grinding it; the baker for baking it; and all must lay on higher prices in case of greater taxes than if there were none. But there are natural checks to all these different occupiers. If the landholder is too rapacious, he gets bad tenants, and his land is injured; the growers of corn being spread over a large extent of country, the open markets are a mutual check upon them; and the same may be said of the miller; and to the baker there is the competition, which arises from the profits of trade, and which brings them down to the level, that is suited to the advantage of the trader and the public. But with respect to the baker a check is introduced by the legislature, which in the peculiar case of bread, fixes a maximum according to the state of the corn markets and the flour, beyond which the bread cannot be sold. On the wisdom of this maximum many doubts have arisen, and the question will probably engage the attention of parliament at its ensuing session, when some alteration may be expected to take place in the corn laws. At a meeting of the common council of the city of London, the subject was taken into consideration, which led to the formation of a committee for the farther examination of it. We cannot expect that all the laws on the settling of the price of bread by authority, should be set aside; though we confess that that seems to be the best policy: yet, if so much cannot be done without fear of disadvantage, counties and cities might be encouraged to try the experiment of leaving for a time the price of bread to itself, and then it will be seen, whether any laws on this subject are necessary. In the mean time, we cannot but consider the stigmas, thrown out against the baker, as unworthy of any man of education, and much more of any man, who aspires to the name of Christian.

The Catholics of Ireland are continuing their efforts for emancipation, and many meetings have been holden on the subject, so that it is likely to undergo another discussion in the house of Commons. In the mean time the agitation of the question is productive of great good. Dr. Milner, a very high churchman, has written very warmly in defence of the church, and full of fears on the evident relaxation of principle on the part of the catholic laity, many of whom differ in his opinion very little from protestants. In this he seems to be perfectly right; for just as the Bible society is bringing together Christians of different denominations, softening their animosities, and leading them nearer to their only Lord, so the emancipation of the Catholics would be a great blow to the influence of the clergy and of the papacy, would bring the catholics and protestants nearer to each other, and teach them that the Christian religion is a very different thing from what the priests on both sides represent it to them. They would in short be guided more by common sense and their bibles, than by the nonsense of the priest and his articles.

Several debates have taken place at the India House on the raising of the salary of the directors, which ended in the appointment of a committee for a fuller investigation of the subject. The government of the company is now vested in the hands of very wealthy merchants, to whom the salary is of very little consequence; the honour of the patronage, attached to the station, far outweighs any pecuniary recompence that can be bestowed on them. Hence many in the company are fearful that, if the salary should be raised so as to become an object to the younger sons of the nobility, and those who are looking for places from the minister, the present system would be completely shaken, and a very different set of men would be introduced into the direction. There is much good sense in this latter argument, particularly as from the circumstances of the company there is already so great a tendency to bring it into the ordinary routine of government.

Improvements in the natural world must not pass unnoticed by us, especially as they frequently have no small influence on the morals of a people. When we read the Spectator, we are astonished at the outrages, so frequently committed at night by men of that rank in life, which would now be ashamed of such conduct. The introduction of lamps tended in a great degree to correct this evil. A farther improvement has taken place, by which the lamp will diffuse a steady light during the whole night, without fear of its being impaired. This is done by means of the gas from coal, which is conveyed from the manufactory by means of pipes to the lamps in every direction. The experiment is tried in the parish of St. Margarets, Westminster, and preparations are making for a similar one in the parish of Shoreditch, and from the very manifest superiority of the gas over the oil lamps, there is great reason to believe, that all London will be in a short time lighted in the same manner, and of course the example will be followed in the country towns. Not only will the streets be in this manner lighted, but even private houses may partake of the benefit of the stream of gas, that passes by them, and in the same manner as water is now carried to any part of the house so may hereafter the material of flame. There was a time, when the greatest philosopher would have been puzzled at the question of supplying a whole town with water up to the tops of the houses, and within a very few years the idea of conveying the materials of flame would in the same manner have been termed visionary. But greater things than these may be expected in a future generation, which will have gotten rid of all our stupid and idle prejudices in favour of war and its miserable heroism, and be devoted to better pursuits, in the improvement of the moral qualities of men, and the rendering of the earth serviceable to his comforts, not to his destruction.

Wonderful is the change in the history of Continental affairs, and at this very moment of writing, sanguine expectations are entertained that he, who so short time ago held in his hands we might almost say the balance of Europe, is driven by the confederated powers back from the Elbe to the Rhine. That he will give up his wonted sway without some violent struggles for its preservation is not to be expected, and a dreadful battle must therefore probably have been fought to determine, what shall be the future condition of France and its dependent kings. This reverse in the affairs of Napoleon might teach man not to depend too much on his own strength. How different is the state of this great hero and warrior, from what it was, when he reviewed his troops last year on the banks of the Niemen, and saw himself at the head of an army not to be equalled perhaps in the history of ancient and modern times. His fate seems to have been sealed at Moscow, though from the greatness of his talents and the physical resources of his dominions he might still have retained, though not his former splendour yet, a decided superiority in the affairs of Europe. France furnished him with a new army. He had the advantage over the confederated armies of Russia and Prussia at first, but the desertion of Austria from him has overthrown his plans, and he is now like a lion caught in the toils.

Bonaparte is now said to have found Dresden no longer tenable. He has marched towards Leipsick, and collected his troops towards him, with the view it is supposed to retreat towards the Rhine. To do this will be a very arduous task; for the confederates will press upon him in every direction. The Bohemian army can follow without apprehension from any thing in its rear, as a fresh army marched from Russia has advanced so far as to set it at liberty for any future operation. The confederates are now therefore numerically far superior to the French, and in cavalry and artillery their preponderance is still more decisive. We are to add to this, that Buonaparte can now depend on the French only that are with him. The tide of victory no longer setting in his favour, Bavaria is watching the favourable moment to desert his cause, and Wirtemberg cannot be expected to remain more faithful. Public opinion was also changed, so that a formidable corps is forming every where, which will materially obstruct the progress of his troops, and cut them off, if they are found detached in small numbers from the main body. Nothing then but too great rashness on the part of the allies can save him from destruction. His fate depends it almost seems on the battle, which by this time probably has been fought, and from which should he be successful, he can only expect to secure his retreat to his own proper dominions.

The alliance between France and Austria having been broken at such a critical time has afforded sufficient room for altercation with the pen, and no small quantity of discussion on this subject has been given to the public through the means of the Parisian press. Few people will bestow much time on this mass of papers, which affords only another instance of the little dependence to be placed on worldly politics. The alliance cemented by a marriage, and strengthened by every consideration which pen and parchment could give, was broken, as naturally might be expected, when the circumstances were so much changed in one of the parties, and the other expected to derive so much greater advantage by forsaking than by standing by his falling friend. That Buonaparte was really deceived in this diplomatic negociation, we cannot imagine. He must soon have seen, that Austria was not to be depended upon, and we are therefore the more surprised, that he should continue the war against such tremendous odds. But he had before beaten them all in the field, and he relied too much upon his good fortune, not recollecting that it had forsaken him at Moscow, and carried away with her those troops with which he was accustomed to victory.

The effect of this new situation of affairs in France is not known. All the wishes of Buonaparte were complied with by his obsequious senate, to whom they were made known by the Empress herself in person. This was done with great pomp and ceremony, and the result was a new conscription of between two and three hundred thousand men to supply the wants of their great sovereign. To vote them was an easy matter, to bring them into the field is a more arduous task, and little support can be derived from the vote in the present crisis. It remains to be seen, whether the French will continue steady to their hero, should he be driven beyond the Rhine, and stand in need of such support; and much depends on the conduct of the confederates should they be masters of the field of battle. Thus after twenty years bloody fighting, the same confederate powers, that met together in Saxony for the partitioning France, may again make the experiment, and meet with similar success But should they act in such a manner, as to offer peace on such terms as will still leave to the French people their territory, a new dynasty may be introduced into that kingdom, and sovereigns and people, having learned more wisdom from their late calamities, may understand how to command and how to obey upon principles which become men instructed by reason, and enlightened by revelation.

To add to the misfortunes of Buonaparte, and to lower that pride, which displayed itself in his boasts and threats against this country, the British standard is unfurled on his own territory. He, who so long threatened our coasts with invasion, and vaunted that he would drive the British legions from Spain into the sea, must foam with rage on hearing that they have beaten his armies, driven them from the Pyrenees, and are now encamped on the soil of France, to take advantage of his new disasters. The fall of St. Sebastians was a prelude to this great event, and has secured the entrance into France: but Pampluna is not yet fallen; and the French are still in great force in Catalonia. Bayonne is a fortress of such strength, that Lord Wellington, who is within a few miles of it, may not think it adviseable to advance far into France till it is subdued; and this may be a work of time and difficulty. The invasion, however, of itself, has a tendency to distract the councils of Paris, and, at any rate, will shew the state of public opinion, and on the defeat of Buonaparte give it an opportunity of displaying itself with greater effect.

From the American continent nothing of great importance has transpired. From Buenos Ayres intelligence is reported to have arrived, which affords us far greater satisfaction than any to be derived from bloodshed, as it announces a victory over prejudice, and a prospect of moral improvement in a people, long kept in Egyptian darkness. One of their chief men has declared himself hostile to the celibacy of the clergy, and this may lead to a reform of their ecclesiastical establishment: and they are desirous that the advantages of the Lancasterian plan of education should be introduced amongst them. Deputies from that part of the world are said to be in this country, charged among other things, to procure information and assistance on this latter subject; and it will be real glory to England if it should thus be the means of adding to the moral improvement of mankind. We hope that both the Bible and the Lancasterian societies will take advantage of this opening to an alliance between the two countries, on such beneficial principles. Let us communicate to them all the instruction we can; and the man, enveloped in the chains of mere sordid self interest, needs not doubt that his expenditure will be returned to him with all the advantages he can desire.

CORRESPONDENCE.

In our next Number, we expect to be able to give some Biographical Account or Obituary of the Rev J. Bealey and the Rev. J. Simpson (of Bath), lately deceased.

THE
MONTHLY REPOSITORY
OF
Theology and General Literature.

No. XCV. NOVEMBER. [Vol. VIII.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

Memoir of Dr. Caleb Ashworth, by Rev. S. Palmer.

Hackney, Oct. 4, 1813.

Sir,

As a department in your Repository is devoted to Biography, and admits brief anecdotes of respectable persons of whose history but little information can, from distance of time, be procured, I am encouraged to send you a few particulars concerning my worthy tutor Dr. Ashworth, in consequence of the notice which I find taken of him in the *Memoir of Mr. Worthington*, in your last Number, p. 526, where a reference is made to the Sermon which I preached on occasion of his death. That sermon, I confess is, as the writer of the Memoir observed to me, very defective in regard to the Doctor's history, of which something might have been introduced consistently with the restraint I was under with respect to his character. With your permission, therefore, I will now attempt to supply that deficiency, so far as I am able, and am sorry that I have so little to communicate worthy the notice of your readers.

Dr. Caleb Ashworth was born at an obscure village in Lancashire, where his father was a lay-preacher, of the particular Baptist denomination; of whom I can relate only this single anecdote which I had from the Dr., which shews him to have possessed some talent; the application of which is not very common, nor indeed very enviable. His congregation, carrying the matter of extemporaneous devotion to such a length as not to allow of singing pre-composed hymns, required him to deliver extempore ones, line by line, with which requisition he continued to comply for some years: in what manner, and with what success, I presume not to say, and leave your readers to judge.

He had three sons brought up to the ministry among the Dissenters, who all had academical education. Mr. Thomas Ashworth, the eldest, whom I well knew by his visits at Daventry, was a man of great piety and an amiable temper. He continued a Baptist, and was many years the pastor of a Calvinistical congregation, at Heckmondwick, in Yorkshire. Though he possessed no great share of learning, and was remarkably plain in his manner and appearance, he was a very useful preacher, and his prayers were peculiarly excellent. A younger brother, Mr. John Ashworth, also continued a Baptist, but joined with those of the General denomination, and was settled in London, where he was a colleague with the celebrated Dr. Foster, and consequently may be supposed a man of considerable talents. But he died young, and Dr. Foster preached and printed his funeral sermon.

Caleb, the subject of this memoir, was early placed for education, under Dr. Doddrige, at Northampton, where, it is presumed, he became a convert to Pædobaptism: and I have in my possession several letters of his relating to that controversy, which he wrote to me on my application to him, when, in the early part of my ministry, I had some difficulties on that subject; and they were of considerable use in determining my judgment and practice.

On finishing his studies at Northampton, he was fixed with the congregation at Daventry, where he spent the rest of his life, though he had an invitation to remove, from a congregation in London, which, if I mistake not, was that at Crosby-square. He was at first chosen as assistant to Mr. James Floyd, who not possessed of very acceptable talents as a preacher, (though very eminent in prayer) upon marrying a lady of considerable fortune, gave up the pastoral charge, to which Mr. Ashworth was then chosen, and he had a flourishing congregation, which after some years required a new gallery to be erected.

He married a lady of Northampton, to whom he was attached during his studies (I think of the name of Hemmings), with whom he had but a slender fortune; so that having a growing family, he soon found himself in those straits which many of his brethren have experienced; a circumstance which occasioned him to give his pupils some prudential hints with respect to matrimonial connexions. One of the disadvantages which he, among many others, felt from a slender income, was his inability to purchase such books and commentaries, as a studious minister most needs and wishes to possess. In this difficulty, however, he had the happiness to find great relief, through the kindness of Dr. Watts, to whom he had been recommended by his tutor, Dr. Doddridge, who had always expressed the warmest friendship for him. Of the truth of this anecdote I have the pleasing proof in a manuscript letter, (among many in my possession, of that excellent man, to Dr. Doddridge) dated Oct. 18, 1746. In the P. S. the Dr. says, "I rejoice to hear so well of Mr. Ashworth. I hope my lady and I have set him up with commentaries, for which he has given us both thanks."

This circumstance leads me to mention a remarkable testimony of his respect to the memory of his kind benefactor, for whose writings both he and his people had a very high esteem. Happening, after the Lord's Day afternoon service, to see, in a newspaper, an account of the death of Dr. Watts, he determined that very evening to give his people a discourse for the improvement of the event, at a lecture which he had been accustomed to hold at an ancient building in the town, called the Abbey. Accordingly, short as the interval was, which admitted only of his writing some brief hints, he delivered a very interesting discourse, of which a friend of Dr. Watts in London who heard of it, requested a copy, and, on the perusal, earnestly desired him to publish it. He accordingly yielded, though not without reluctance and a modest apology in the advertisement. It is entitled *Reflections on the fall of a great man*, on 2 *Sam.* iii. 38. It affords proof of wonderful facility in composition, and is at least equal to any other discourse published on the same occasion, although at that time he could be but about 28 years of age: it soon came to a second edition.

When, upon the death of Dr. Doddridge the academy was removed to Daventry, Mr. Ashworth erected a new house for the reception of the students, contiguous to the meeting-house, and a new parsonage-house was built by the congregation at the same time. Though the situation was by no means eligible, being in a narrow street, close to a very public road, and opposite to a large inn; both the erections, which were under his superintendance, were extremely well contrived, considering the narrow extent of the premises; and the institution retained its respectability. By the strict discipline which he maintained, and his unwearied application, together with his prudence and friendship, the house was usually filled with pupils. Besides those who had entered on academical studies, there were a few educated in grammar learning, who could not be accommodated in the house. These had lodgings in the town and were instructed by a clergyman, but were required to attend the domestic worship of the academy, and Mr. Ashworth devoted no small portion of his time to their improvement.

The academical building which he himself erected, with the assistance of friends and of the trustees, became his own property, and by means of great prudence and economy (which however were accompanied with great liberality) he was enabled to acquire some pecuniary remuneration for his labour, and in a course of years his circumstances were so much improved that he not only brought up his family with reputation, but left those who survived him a decent competency.

In the year 1759, Mr. Ashworth received a Doctor's diploma; a distinction unsought by him, but not undeserved, for not only the office he sustained as a teacher of theology, as well as other sciences, but his general respectability and influence in the station he was called to fill, gave him a much better claim to such a title than many who have obtained it. And had it not been for his great diffidence and his backwardness to appear as an author, he might have acquired much literary fame. He had a particular taste for Jewish antiquities, and he so much improved Dr. Doddridge's Lectures on that subject, that the publication of his manuscript would supersede any thing yet extant upon that branch of science.

He was once urged by some persons in London to publish a Course of Sermons on a Particular Subject, and he so far complied as to transcribe them for the press, but afterwards hearing nothing from those who made the request (probably because he refused the invitation to remove to the metropolis), he very willingly desisted from the publication; and these

M.SS. it is supposed he destroyed, as he did many others a little before his death.

There is great reason to believe that his intense application to study, and the want of exercise sufficient for a man of his corpulence, injured his constitution, naturally strong. He had for many months been afflicted with a dropsy in the chest, which the last time he was in London greatly affected his breath, and at length put a period to his life at a time when he might have been expected to enjoy many years of health and usefulness.

Instead of enlarging on his character and talents (which it would be pleasant for me to do, were it not through fear of trespassing too much on your pages) I will only refer your readers to your extract from Mr. Worthington's Memoir of Mr. Crabb, and to the highly honourable testimony of Mr. Belsham, in his farewell sermon at Hackney; a copy of which, with a few other particulars, are given in the notes subjoined to the *Letters from Mr. Job Orton to Dissenting Ministers, &c.* among which is one of some length to Dr. Ashworth, for whom in several others of those letters he expresses the highest respect.

Dr. Ashworth had three sons and three daughters, none of whom are now living. It is a very affecting circumstance that the whole family, though very robust, were cut off in the space of a few years. His eldest son, Mr. John Ashworth, at first designed for the ministry, preferred the business of a grazier, and was placed under the famous Mr. Bakewell, in Leicestershire. He afterwards became the landlord of the Wheat-Sheaf Inn, opposite to the academy, and married the daughter of his predecessor, by whom he had one child, a very accomplished young lady, who still survives.

If in any of the above particulars I have committed a mistake, I shall readily submit to the correction of any surviving pupil of the Dr., by whom also I shall be glad to see any material deficiency supplied. I am not insensible to his failings; but such were his excellencies, that to this day, after the lapse of above half a century, I often reflect with pleasure on the years I spent under his tuition as some of the happiest of my life.

I am, Sir,

Respectfully yours,

S. PALMER.

EXTRACTS FROM NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Account of the Pope and Court of Rome.

[From Eustace's Classical Tour through Italy, in 2 Vols. 4to. 1813.—Appendix to Vol. II.]

Though the Pope is both Bishop and Prince, yet his titles, dress, equipage, and the whole ceremonial of his court, are adapted to the first of these characters. He is styled Holiness, the Holy Father, and sometimes in history the Sovereign Pontiff, but the former appellations, as more appropriate to his duties and functions, are exclusively used in his own court. His robes are the same as those of a bishop in pontificals (excepting the stole and the colour, which is white, not purple). His vestments, when he officiates in church, as well as his mitre, do not differ from those of other prelates. The *tiara* seems originally to have been an ordinary mitre, such as is still worn by the Greek Patriarchs. The three circlets, which have raised it into a triple crown, were added at different periods, and it is said, for different mystic reasons. The first or lowest seems to have been originally a mere border, gradually enriched with gold and diamonds. The second was the invention of Boniface VIII. about the year 1300; and to complete the mysterious decoration, the third was superadded about the middle of the fourteenth century. The use of the tiara is confined to certain extraordinary occasions, as in most great ceremonies the Pope uses the common episcopal mitre.

Whenever he appears in public, or is approached even in private, his person is encircled with reverence and with majesty. In public, a large silver cross raised on high is carried before him, as a sacred banner, the church bells ring as he passes, and all kneel in his sight. When he officiates at the patriarchal Basilicæ he is carried from his apartments in the adjoining palace to the church in a chair of state, though in the chancel his throne is merely an ancient episcopal chair, raised only a few steps above the seats of the cardinals or clergy. In private, as the pontifical palaces are vast and magnificent, there are perhaps more apartments to be traversed, and greater appearances of splendour in the approach to his person, than in an introduction to any other sovereign. In his antichamber, a prelate in full robes is always in waiting, and when the bell rings, the door of the pontifical apartment opens, and the Pope is seen in a chair of state with a little table before him. The person presented kneels once at the threshold, again in the middle of the room, and lastly, at the feet of the Pontiff, who, according to circumstances, allows him to kiss the cross embroidered on his shoes, or presents his hand to raise him. The Pontiff then converses with him a short time, and dismisses him with some slight present of beads, or medals, as a memorial. The ceremony of genu-flection is again repeated, and the doors close.*

---

* Some Protestants have objected to this ceremony, which, after all, is only a mark of respect formerly paid to every bishop,† and still kept up in a court tenacious of its ancient observances. *It is said*, that Horace Walpole, when presented to Benedict XIV. stood for some time in a posture of hesitation, when the Pope, who was remarkable for cheerfulness and humour, exclaimed, "*Kneel down, my son, receive the blessing of an old man; it will do you no harm!*" Upon which the young traveller instantly fell on his knees, and was so much pleased with the conversation and liveliness of Benedict, that he took every occasion of waiting upon him, and testifying his respect during his stay at Rome. In truth, English gentlemen have always been received by the Popes with peculiar kindness and condescension, and every indulgence is shewn to their opinions, or, as the Romans must term them, their prejudices, and even to their caprices.

† Fleury, Mœurs des Chretiens. xxxii. ad finem.

The pomp which environs the Pontiff in public, and attracts the attention so forcibly, may perhaps appear to many, a glorious and enviable distinction; but there are few, I believe, who would not, if accompanied by it in all the details of ordinary life, feel it an intolerable burden. Other sovereigns have their hours of relaxation; they act their part in public, and then throw off their robes, and mix in the domestic circle with their family or their confidants. The Pope has no hours of relaxation; always encumbered with the same robes, surrounded by the same attendants, and confined within the magic circle of etiquette, he labours for ever under the weight of his dignity, and may, if influenced by ordinary feelings, often sigh in vain, for the leisure and the insignificance of the college or the cloister. A morning of business and application closes with a solitary meal; a walk in the gardens of the *Quirinal* or the *Vatican*, a visit to a church or an hospital, are his only exercises. Devotion and business, the duties of the Pontiff and of the Prince, successively occupy his hours, and leave no vacant interval for the indulgence of the taste, or the arrangement of the affairs of the individual. What honours can compensate for a life of such restraint and confinement! (P. 620—623)

On the whole, the person and conduct of the Pope, whether in public or in private, are under perpetual restraint and constant inspection. The least deviation from strict propriety or even from customary forms, would be immediately noticed, published, and censured in pasquinades. Leo X. loved shooting, and by the change of dress necessary for that amusement, gave scandal. Clement XIV. (Ganganelli) was advised by his physicians to ride; he rode in the neighbourhood of his *Alban Villa*, and, it is said, offended the people of the country not a little, by that supposed levity. Benedict XIV. wished to see the interior arrangement of a new theatre, and visited it before it was opened to the public; the next morning an inscription appeared over the door by which he had entered, *Porta santa; plenary indulgence to all who enter*. These anecdotes suffice to shew the joyless uniformity of the papal court, as well as the strict decorum that pervades every department immediately connected with the person of the Pontiff.

The custom of being carried in a chair of state has also given offence, and is certainly not very conformable to the modern practice even of courts; however it is another remnant of ancient manners, a mode of conveyance, (less luxurious indeed) copied from the *lectica*, so much in use among the Romans. In the earlier ages, the custom of the Popes as of other Bishops was to pass from the sacristy through the church on foot,* leaning on two priests, and thus advance to the altar; a custom more conformable to Christian humility and to the simplicity not only of ancient but even of modern times. In fact, in all the ceremonial of the Roman Church and Court, the only parts liable to misrepresentation or censure, are certain additions of later times, when, in religious pomps and court pageants, in dress and in style, all was inflated and cumbersome. The rule of reform is easy and obvious; to prune off the excrescences of barbarous ages, and to restore the majestic forms of antiquity.

---

* Ordo Rom. Primus et Secund. *Muratori.*

Some centuries ago the Popes considered themselves authorized, by their temporal sovereignty, to give the same exhibitions and tournaments, and to display the same scenes of festivity and magnificence in the Vatican, as were beheld at the courts and in the palaces of other princes; nor did such ill-placed pageants seem at that period to have excited surprise or censure. But the influence of the Council of Trent, though its direct interference was strongly repelled, reached the recesses of the pontifical palace, and the general rigour of discipline established by it, ascended from the members to the head, and at length pervaded the whole body. Hence the austere features of the papal court, and the monastic silence that reigns through the vast apartments of the *Vatican* and of the *Quirinal* palaces; and hence also the solitary repasts and the perpetual abstemiousness of the Pontiff's table. (P. 624—626.)

We proceed to the College of Cardinals, the real senate of modern Rome, and the council of the Pontiff. The title of Cardinal was originally given to the parochial clergy of Rome: it seems to have been taken from the imperial court, where, in the time of Theodosius, the principal officers of the state had that appellation added as a distinction to their respective dignities. The number of titles, or churches which give a title to this dignity, is seventy-two, including the six suburban bishoprics; their principal and most honourable privilege is that of electing the Pope, and it is easy to conceive that their dignity and importance increased with that of the Roman See itself, and that they shared alike its temporal and its spiritual pre-eminence. As they are the counsellors, so they are the officers of the Pontiff, and are thus entrusted with the management of the church at large and of the Roman State in particular.

In the middle ages, when the Roman Bishop seemed to engross to himself the government, both spiritual and temporal, of Christendom, and acted at once with all the power and authority of Emperor and of Pontiff, the cardinalate became the next most conspicuous dignity, and rivalled, sometimes eclipsed, the splendor of royalty itself.

Even after the plenitude of papal power had been retrenched, and the Reformation had withdrawn so many provinces from its dominion, the purple retained its lustre, and a cardinal still continued to rank with princes of the blood royal. This honour they possess even in our times, and in spite of the Revolution itself, they enjoy it in such courts as are not immediately under French controul. Thus the College of Cardinals has made a conspicuous figure in Europe for the space of at least one thousand years. The Roman Senate itself can scarce be said to have supported its fame and grandeur for so long a period; in fact, in dignity, rank, talents, and majesty, the sacred College is worthy to succeed and to represent that august assembly. One of the advantages or rather the peculiar glory of this body is, that it admits men of eminence in virtue, talents, or rank, without any regard to country or nation, thus paying a tribute to merit in opposition to local prejudices, and inviting genius from every quarter of the universe, to receive the honours, and at the same time to increase the lustre, of the Roman purple. The classic writers of the age of Leo, while they beheld so many distinguished characters collected in this assembly, and while they received so much encouragement from its learned members, looked up to it with reverence and affection, and joyfully applied to it the titles and appellations of the ancient senate. It was with them *amplissimus cœtus, imperii et rationis arx—portus omnium gentium—Orbis terrarum concilium, &c.* Its members were the *purpurati patres — gentium patroni — Urbis principes, &c.* It cannot therefore be a matter of surprise that this dignity should at all times have been the object of ecclesiastical ambition, and been accepted with joy by the sons even of the first monarchs in Europe.

The cardinals are named by the Pope, though all the Catholic powers are allowed to recommend a certain number. Some hats are generally kept in reserve, in case of any emergency, so that the number is seldom full. The nomination is not often abused, and the honour so rarely misplaced, that the public has not been known to complain for a long lapse of years.

The grand assembly of the cardinals is called the consistory, where the Pontiff presides in person. Here they appear in all the splendour of the purple and form a most majestic senate, such as might almost justify the emphatical expression of the Greek orator. But this assembly is not precisely a council, as it seldom discusses, but witnesses the ratification of measures previously weighed and adopted in the cabinet of the Pontiff. Here therefore public communications are announced, foreign ambassadors received, cardinals created, formal compliments made and answered, in short, the exterior splendour of sovereignty displayed to the public eye. But the principal prerogative of a cardinal is exercised in the Conclave, so called because the members of the sacred College are then confined within the precincts of the great halls of the *Vatican* palace, where they remain immured till they agree in the election of a Pontiff. The halls are divided into temporary apartments: each cardinal has four small rooms, and two attendants called conclavists. The Senator of Rome, the conservators, and the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, then in the city, guard the different entrances into the Conclave, and prevent all communication. These precautions to exclude all undue influence and intrigue, from such an assembly, on such an occasion, though not always effectual, deserve applause. However, the clashing interests of the different courts are so well-poised, that even intrigue can do but little mischief; for if the cardinals attached to any sovereign make particular efforts in favour of any individual of the same interest, they only awaken the jealousy and rouse the opposition of all the other courts and parties. In fact, the choice generally falls on a cardinal totally unconnected with party, and therefore exceptionable to none, exempt from glaring defects, and ordinarily remarkable for some virtue or useful accomplishment, such as learning, dignity, moderation, firmness.

It is not my intention to specify all the forms of *etiquette* observed, or the ceremonies practised during the process, or at the conclusion of the election; two or three, however, I must notice for reasons which will appear sufficiently obvious; one is the custom of putting the tickets containing the votes of the cardinals on the *patina* (or communion plate), and then into the chalice: now, however important these votes may be, and however intimate their connection with the welfare of the church, yet to apply to them the vases devoted in a peculiar manner to the most awful institutions of religion, seems to pass beyond disrespect, and almost to border on profanation. The next ceremony to which I have alluded, is that called the adoration of the Pope; it takes place almost immediately after his election, when he is placed in a chair on the altar of the Sixtine chapel, and there receives the homage of the cardinals: this ceremony is again repeated on the high altar of St. Peter's. Now in this piece of pageantry I object not to the word *adoration*; no one who knows Latin, or reflects upon the sense which it bears on this and on a thousand other occasions, will cavil at it, though he may wish it otherwise applied. Nor do I find fault with the throne, he who is at the same time both Pontiff and Prince, has, from time and custom, perhaps, a double title to such a distinction. But why should the altar be made his footstool? The altar, the *beauty of holiness*, the throne of the *victim** *lamb*, the *mercy-seat* of the temple of Christianity; why should the altar be converted into the footstool of a mortal?

I mean not, however, while I condemn this ceremony, to extend the censure to those who practise or who tolerate it. Besides the difficulty of altering an ancient rite (if this piece of pageantry, however, deserve that epithet) the world is too well acquainted with the virtues of the late Pontiffs to suspect them of want of humility. To conform to an established custom, and refer the honour to him whom they represent, the *Prince of Pastors*, and the *Master of Apostles*, appears perhaps to them a greater act of humility than to excite surprise, and perhaps to give offence, by an untimely and unexpected resistance. Be the motives of toleration however what they may, the practice is not edifying to any, it is offensive to most, and of consequence, as producing some evil and no good, it ought to be suppressed.

The last ceremony which I shall notice is the following. As the new Pontiff advances towards the high altar of St. Peter's, the master of the ceremonies kneeling before him, sets fire to a small quantity of tow placed on the top of a gilt staff, and as it blazes and vanishes in smoke, thus addresses the Pope, *Sancte Pater! sic transit gloria mundi!* This ceremony is repeated thrice. Such allusions to the nothingness of sublunary grandeur have, we all know, been introduced into the ceremonials of royal pageantry, both in ancient and modern times; nor is it mentioned here as a novelty, but as a proof of the transcendent glory which once encompassed the papal throne.—*Nemo est in mundo sine aliqua tribulatione vel angustiâ, quamvis Rex sit vel Papa.—De Imit. Christi.* I. 22. The pontifical dignity was then, it seems, supposed to be the complement and perfection of regal and even imperial power.

---

* Hic suâ pascit populos fideles
Carne, qui mundi scelus omne tollit
Agnus, et fusi pretium cruoris
Ipse propinat.
HYM. DEL.

Yet there is no sovereign who seems to stand in so little need of this lesson as the Roman Pontiff. The robes which encumber his motions, the attendants that watch his steps, and the severe magnificence that surrounds him on all sides, are so many mementos of his duties and of his responsibility; while the churches which he daily frequents, lined with monuments, that announce the existence and the short reigns of his predecessors; nay, the very city which he inhabits, the sepulchre of ages and of empires, the sad monument of all that is great and glorious beneath the sun, remind him at every step of fallen grandeur and of human mortality. One lesson more the Pontiff is now destined to receive daily, and that is of all others the most impressive and most mortifying; power escaping from his grasp, and influence evaporating in the shadow of a name.—*Sic transit gloria mundi.*

Of the retinue and procession of the Pontiff at the inauguration, we shall say no more; but of the ceremonial of the Roman court in general give the opinion of the most intelligent of French travellers, in his own words, after having observed, that to the eye of an Englishman, though as partial to pomp and stateliness as the native of a northern region can be, the effect would be increased if the quantum of ceremony were considerably diminished. *La pompe qui environne le Pape, et les ceremonies de l'Eglise Romaine sont les plus majestueuses, les plus augustes, et les plus imposantes qu'on puisse voir.**

From the state and the exterior of the Popes in general, we will now pass to the person and the character of the present Pontiff. Pius VII. is of a noble family, *Chiaramonte* by name, and became early in life a Benedictin monk of the Abbey of *S. Georgio*, at *Venice*. His learning, virtue, and mildness, raised him shortly above the level of his brethren, attracted the attention of the Superiors first, and afterwards of the late Pope, Pius VI. who had an opportunity of noticing the Father *Chiaramonte*, on his way to *Vienna*, and who shortly after promoted him to the see of *Imola*, and afterwards raised him to the purple. His career in this splendid line, seems to have been marked rather by the mild and conciliating virtues than by the display of extraordinary abilities; we accordingly find him esteemed and beloved by all parties, and respected even by the French generals, and by *Buonaparte* in particular.

---

* *La Lande.*—The reader will perhaps be surprised to find no account of various observances, of which he has heard or read much, such as the *open stool*, the examination, &c. &c. but his surprise will cease, or perhaps increase, when he is assured that no such ceremonies exist.

When the late Pope was torn from his capital by the orders of the French Directory, and dragged prisoner into France, the cardinals were banished, or deported with circumstances of peculiar cruelty, and the cardinal *Chiaramonte* of course shared in common with his brethren, the hardships and the dangers of this persecution.

On the death of Pius VI. the cardinals assembled in conclave at *Venice*, and in a short time unanimously proclaimed cardinal *Chiaramonte* Pope. This election took place in the month of March 1800. The French were obliged to evacuate Rome about the same period, and the Pope embarked for *Ancona*, and made his public entry into Rome in the following April.

We may easily conceive the joy, both of the Pontiff and of the people on this happy occasion. The scene was unusually splendid, but it owed its splendor not to the opulence of the sovereign, but to the zeal of the subject. The guard that lined the streets and escorted the Pontiff, consisted of a numerous body of young patricians; the triumphal arches and decorations were supplied by the Roman people, and the equipage of the Pontiff himself was the voluntary homage of the generous *Colonna*, a prince truly worthy of the name of a Roman. In fact, the Pope was personally as poor as the Apostle whom he succeeds, and like him brought to his flock nothing but the piety of the pastor and the affection of the father. As the procession moved towards the *Vatican*, tears were observed more than once streaming down his cheeks, and the details which he afterwards received of the distress occasioned by the rapacity of the late invaders, could only increase his anguish.

To relieve the sufferings of his people, and to restore the finances of the country, was his first object, and to attain it he began by establishing a system of the strictest economy in his own household and around his own person. He next suppressed all immunities or exemptions, and subjected the nobility and the clergy to the same or to greater burthens than the lower orders; this regulation, so simple in itself, and so just, is yet little practised on the continent, where in general the weight of taxation falls upon those who are least capable of bearing it. The French republic affects indeed to adopt it, but in fact uses it only as a convenient method of plundering the rich without relieving the poor. Such are the beneficial effects of this regulation, that though some oppressive and unpopular duties have, I believe, been removed, and the sum imposed on each individual diminished, yet the general amount of the taxes is considerably increased. Other salutary arrangements are, it is said, in contemplation, and the good intentions, the sense, and the virtuous feelings of Pius VII. encourage the hope that his reign, if he be not thwarted in his designs, will be the commencement of an era of reform and of prosperity.

The Pope is of a middle stature; his eyes are dark, and his hair is black and curly; his countenance is mild and benevolent, expressing rather the tranquil virtues of his first profession, than the sentiments congenial to his latter elevation. However, it is whispered by those who are more intimately acquainted with his character, that he can on occasions display great firmness and decision; that he is influenced much more by his own judgment than by the opinions of his ministers, and that he adheres irrevocably to his determination. At the present crisis, when the temporal possessions of the Roman church are at the mercy of the strongest, a spirit of conciliation is perhaps the best calculated to preserve their integrity; and even in the spiritual concerns of the Apostolic See, the interests of religion may doubtless be best consulted by such concessions and changes in discipline, as the reason or even the prejudices of the age may seem to demand. In both these respects, and particularly in the latter, the lenient and judicious Pontiff is likely to employ his authority in a manner highly conducive to public utility. (p. 628—637.)

ORIGINAL LETTERS.

From the late Robert Robinson to the Rev. Mr. Gentleman of Kidderminster.

SIR,

In looking over some papers the other day, I met with the following letter, which you may perhaps think worthy of inserting in your Repository, as it must have been one of the last letters which Mr. Robinson ever wrote, and stands in need of no external proof of its authenticity.

The following week an advertisement appeared to this effect. On such a day a Sermon *will* be preached at Kidderminster, and by the Rev. R. Robinson, but before that period he was a lifeless corpse. From that time I determined never to make use of the word *will*, as applied to future events, especially to religious services; as being inconsistent both with the uncertainty of future events, and with an express apostolic injunction: "Go to now, ye that say, we *will* go into such a city, &c. whereas ye ought to say, if the *Lord will* we shall live and do this or that."

Yours, &c. B. C.

Chesterton,
Tuesday, May 25, 1790.

REV. SIR,

This morning your favour came to hand. It is, like yourself, a pleasing compound of piety and politeness. I own, it gives me a great deal of pain to feel my incompetence, and foresee my inequality to the good work which your complaisance hath assigned me. Indeed my cold hath lain harder upon me than any other of my life, and to go so far to bray like an ass sinks my courage. I have but one hope, and that is, that change of air will do me good, at least every body tells me so.

I feel myself extremely obliged to you for forming such an agreeable plan of journeying. I intend to have in this instance, but to resign myself wholly to the disposal of my friends, and I trust they will prescribe me no clashing rules. If they be happy, I shall be so, here, there, any where.

I intend to travel in a single-horse-chaise, for the benefit of accommodating the journey to my own feelings, to go, to stay, to stop, to eat, to fast, just as my feeble stomach will give me leave. It is also as cheap, if not cheaper, than the road machines. My youngest son, a sailor just returned from the Levant, and at present on a visit here, intends to pilot me out and home, and I indulge myself in indulging him, for he is neither a booby nor a knave, but he is deeply infected with heresy, of which to be sure Dr. Priestley is like to cure him.

Most certainly, unless all men be liars, the Leasowes, Hagley, Hales-Owen, Enville, &c. are fine scenes, and tend to enrapture the beholder; but set to music by Mr. Gentleman's wise conversation, I shall lay aside the stare, and dispose myself to listen and learn. You live in happy scenes, and I murmur because I am tethered to willows, priests, and bogs and fens.

I think the printed sheet is fine, because it is tender, and goes to sooth and supple the heart.

I mean to set out on Wednesday, June 2nd, to spend that day with a quondam clergyman about ten miles off, a Mr. Hammond, who fled for freedom from established creeds and rituals to our land of liberty, and now shines with peculiar lustre. Thence I proceed by easy stages to Birmingham by Saturday night. I shall be free from all engagements by Thursday, and intend to get home the Tuesday or Wednesday night following. Pray God I may not be interrupted by illness. I am, dear Sir, with truest esteem, most affectionately yours,

R. Robinson, miserably hoarse.

Original Letter of the late W. Huntington.

Bristol, Nov. 16,—86.

Rev'd Father in the Lord,—grace, mercy & peace be with thee,

If God permit and you approve I will onour your pulpit next Thursday evening—onour it I say—with the person of the vilest sinner that ever liv'd—and in possession of a Hope that can never die. If you want to know my peddigree—I am by Birth a Beggar, by practice a devil, by trade a coal-hever, by profession—and possession a sinner saved, by principul a stiff decenter, and one of God's own making, for it was he alone that call'd, ordained me, & sent me out—and he has bin my bishop, my tuter, my provider and my defence ever since—else I had bin kill'd or starv'd long ago—If you or your people are fond of the origginal languages—of eloquince—orratory—or grammer, I am the man that can disapoint them all. But if apostolick ignorance will sute them—they will go nigh to gleen a few scraps of that sort—but my degrees will promis nothing further than that. But to inform my Rev'd Father a little about my iregularities—I am in my prayers very short—in my sermons short also—unless the master attends the feast. If so and the cruse gets a spring of oyl in it—then I generally drop all thoughts of working by the day—nor can I give it up until I have emtied the whole content—tho' I know I shall get no more without much knocking and a deal of calling at mercies door. This I call liberality—and am vain enough to think that it is furvant charity—and *that* charity which if aplyed covers a multitude of sins—and no wonder when we hold forth freely the blood and righteousness of him that cleansith from all the guilt of sin—and the robe that covers all the remains of sin. Rev'd father, God bless you—abundant happyness, comfort and sucksess attend bouth you and your family and your flock, while I remain, tho unknown, affectionately yours,

Wm. HUNTINGTON.

The Rev'd Mr. Parsons,
Claverton Street, Bath.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

Essay on the Relation between Protestant Nonconformity and nonconformity to the World.

Sept. 30, 1813.

Εκ τȣ κοσμȣ ȣκ εισι.

The attempt to produce unity of faith and worship by means of compulsion, would seem to be one of the wildest measures which ever originated in the mind of man. It is easy to perceive that such a scheme, even when most successful, can reach no further than the language and the conduct, and cannot fetter the thoughts. The result of it may be temporary concord in ignorance or hypocrisy; but its final influence cannot be auspicious even to the cause which it is designed to serve. It can only promote some present, some momentary benefit. In no age, except in one in which it would be needless, an age of total darkness and barbarism, could it answer its intended purpose.

We may well be astonished that any efforts of this kind should have been made since the revival of learning in Europe. But History records the fact. During the reign of perhaps the most profligate monarch who has filled the English throne, a pretended zeal for the honour and welfare of the ecclesiastical establishment, dictated the famous Act of Uniformity, which took effect on August 24, 1662.

By the provisions of it the clergy were obliged, in the words of an historian who had no partiality for the seceders,* "either to relinquish their livings or to sign the articles required of them:" and this writer confesses that "the terms of subscription had been made strict and rigid, on purpose to disgust all the zealous and scrupulous among the Presbyterians," (so he incorrectly styles them) "and deprive them of their livings."

What was the issue? I will state it in my author's language, that there may be no suspicion of exaggeration. "About two thousand of the clergy, in one day, relinquished their cures, and, to the astonishment of the court, sacrificed their interest to their religious tenets." That day was what he calls *the fatal St. Bartholomew,* already signalized in the annals of persecution, already stained by the treacherous massacre of the Protestants at Paris ninety years before.

Fatal it might justly be denominated: it was so, in the opinion of Mr. Locke, to the church and to religion. The ejected ministers were not only the most popular, but the holiest and most useful of the clergy. For the body of the people to be deprived of their labours and examples, was a national affliction and disgrace. It is the prerogative, however, of the Supreme Ruler that he can, in the most effectual manner, bring good from events which human beings are inclined to regard as unmixed evils. By the Act of Uniformity the interests of religious freedom and virtue have been ultimately advanced: the excellent men to whom I have alluded were the fathers of Protestant dissent.

---

* Hume's Hist. &c. Vol. VII. (1793) 384.

There is no quality by which these venerable confessors appear to have been so much distinguished as superiority to the world. In quitting their benefices they had shewn that they could resist its smiles, when conscience challenged their allegiance: after they had quitted them, they were called to encounter the frowns of men, and terrors and sufferings for the sake of truth. Very few out of this large number returned to the bosom of the Establishment: very few were content to remain long or altogether in silence and inactivity. They esteemed, and rightly esteemed, it their duty to preach, as they were able, even though fines and imprisonments, and bonds and cruel mockings awaited them in consequence. Their governing maxim was, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Accordingly, though their temporal situation was commonly mean, and often indigent; though, as may be supposed, they were frequently incapable of providing their families with bread for the passing day, and still less for the morrow, though, in not a few cases, they were pursued, like criminal outcasts and fugitives, from town to town and village to village, and were compelled to leave their homes, not knowing whither they were to go, yet with the faith of the patriarch, whom in situation they resembled, they "endured as seeing him who is invisible." Thus, they kindled a refulgent light, which is far from having been obscured through successive years. Had they possessed those superior advantages for the study of the scriptures with which their descendants have been favoured, it is probable that they would have abandoned some of their sentiments on articles of discipline and doctrine. In respect, however, of moral, of devotional, of Christian excellence, they are among the foremost of those illustrious spirits of whom the world was not worthy.

The bond then which unites Protestant dissent and a dissent from the maxims and manners that characterize the generality of men, is *religious principle.* I am far from even intimating that this principle may not be found in numbers of the conformists to an established church. But I mean to say that it *must* influence the minds and the lives of *consistent* dissenters, because, as their profession of religion is at least unattended by temporal advantages, it were difficult, perhaps impossible, to discover any inferior reason for their separation. Now, it is precisely on account of their devout and conscientious attachment to what they regarded as the suggestions of duty, that our nonconformist forefathers are entitled to our veneration.

But although the relation between Protestant dissent and dissent from whatever is criminal, frivolous, and of hurtful tendency in the customs of the world, consists in religious principle, it ought to be shewn in what manner religious principle operates to produce and aid both.

Nonconformity to an ecclesiastical establishment is, or should be, a *religious* act. It is a case in which we render unto God the things that we owe to God. Nothing political, nothing civil, invites us to dissent. Such considerations cannot govern those who voluntarily support their own forms of worship, while they also contribute to the support of modes of faith and prayer which have the exclusive patronage of the state. Protestant dissenters separate themselves from the mass of the people, that they may offer what they look upon as a purer homage, that they may attend with greater effect to subjects which concern their everlasting peace: they separate themselves through a rational fear that religion will be corrupted and deeply injured by the interference of human authority with its solemn requisitions. If their nonconformity then do not engage them to be strictly religious, that is, if it do not render them in a just sense nonconformists to the world, they are chargeable with gross inconsistency; and the sincerity of their avowed principles will be suspected, even if the falsehood of them cannot be demonstrated.

Here it may be asked, Are there no instances of what we might call hereditary dissent? None of families and individuals continuing to secede from a church established by law, because their fathers thus seceded before them? I shall not deny that there may be some examples of the kind: habit has always a mighty and often an unfelt dominion over men. But where every temporal motive is thrown into one scale, and where nothing but the force of custom weighs in the other, the former, as facts may teach us, will usually prevail.

Protestant dissent cannot be maintained where it is entirely or in a high degree unaccompanied by the spirit of vital, fervent, and active religion. If it be only nominal, it will quickly sink either in an indifference to all religious principles, or in an unreflecting, perhaps a bigoted conformity to established practices and tenets. Devotion, benevolence, and holy zeal must uphold the cause of nonconformity. The principles on which it rests, however true and important, must not be cherished as merely speculative propositions.

A life of strict religion, the happiest which a man can lead, was the life of our nonconformist forefathers; this, the acquisition which they sought and gained. If we follow their example, we shall not simply advance our dearest personal interests, but shall secure and extend the credit of the dissent which they testified, and of which their posterity, it may be presumed, are desirous of being considered as the enlightened patrons. Let those descendants rank among the honourable band of nonconformists to the world, by their punctuality in secret prayer, in family worship, in attendance on Christian ordinances and on the duties of social piety.

I add a few words on the last instance of obedience to the claims at once of religion and of Protestant dissent. Punctuality on the part of congregations as well as of ministers in public worship, tends to cement their mutual relation, to render it useful and happy, and is indeed an act of justice on the side of each. To the character of the particular societies who exemplify it, and to that of the denomination under which they rank, it is not a little honourable; while the want of it lessens their respectability and, with this, their capacity of doing good. All men, moreover, need the dedication of no inconsiderable portion of their time to acts which are immediately religious; in order that, by these means, the cares and vanities of life may be prevented from engrossing our attention and ruining our peace. But I am the advocate of this regularity chiefly that our nonconformity from the established church, may serve the purpose of rendering us superior to the world, and that the enemies of dissent may not reproach us with relaxation of principle and a proneness to follow the thoughtless multitude, at the voice of ease or luxury or pleasure.

So far as nonconformity draws the eyes of men upon the separatists, it is favourable to the advancement of personal religion. It is a motive to the more exemplary discharge of religious duties and the zealous cultivation of the virtues of the Christian character. Though we are never to do any thing merely for the sake of our being seen of men, yet, when, for other reasons, their attention is directed towards us, we shall, surely, make it our care that our deportment be such as to endure the test of even the most hostile and envious observation! *Sects* (as the several classes of Dissenters are often lightly and invidiously termed) are not surveyed with indifference by the persons in the midst of whom they live. In the present day many circumstances concur to render them objects of thought: and they will be considered and spoken of with increasing honour by reflecting men in proportion as it is found that their nonconformity to the establishment, is accompanied with an equally scrupulous nonconformity to the vanities of the age.

Nor has dissent any formidable enemy except in the smiles, the treacherous arts and the magic influences of the world. In vain has that world assailed it by argument or the appearance of argument: the principles of nonconformity are learnt in the school of Christ and from the lessons of his apostles. In vain have men attempted to crush Dissenters by persecution and by terrors; no external force can subdue conscience and religious principle. But prosperity is more to be dreaded by the separatist than the blackest frowns or severest buffetings of adversity.—Prosperity may lull him into those dangerous slumbers which precede death: it may inspire him with a sense of safety which portends the near approach of ruin.

Rational, Christian nonconformity to the world, will preserve us from this evil. No fear of singularity, no love of power, gain and pleasure, will draw aside the truly religious man from the strait path of truth and duty. Over *him religion* will have more controul than *honour* has over men who are of the world.

N.

Improved Version.

Sir,

I find by a letter written lately by Mr. Madge, in defence of what Mr. Walpole calls the Unitarian, and what is generally known by the title of an Improved Version of the New Testament, that in consequence of the demand for this publication a new edition will soon go to the press. I do not know whether Mr. Madge was one of the editors of this work, though I am a subscriber to it and highly approved of the plan on which I understood it was to be executed. But previously to a new edition something seems due both to the subscribers and to the public. Of the persons who had the superintendence of the publication some may be dead, others removed to an inconvenient distance, or there may have been valuable additions to the original number. Now, Sir, I know no publication in which the information I am desiring can be so well communicated as in your's, and I should be much obliged to Mr. Madge, who seems by his letters to be well acquainted with the editors, or to any other gentleman who has the means of doing it, to inform the numerous individuals interested in this work as subscribers, and the public at large, what is the present state of the committee which undertook the Improved Version. A list of the original committee would be acceptable, as from the two lists we may see what changes have been made by time or other causes in it.

I remain, Sir,
Your's respectfully,
A SUBSCRIBER.

Book-Worm. No. IX.

Sir, *Oct.* 23, 1813.

There was printed in 1793, among the tracts of the Unitarian Book Society, "A Designed End to the Socinian Controversy, or a rational and plain Discourse, to prove that no other person but the Father of Christ is God most High," first printed in 1695. In the preface to the edition of 1793 it is justly regretted that the "personal history of the writer" is unknown. It is added, indeed, on the authority of Dr. Hickes, in 1695, that among "many heretical and Socinian books seized and stopt" this was "taken with its author." I very lately gained some additional information on this subject by finding on a book-stall the following publication:—*A Divine Antidote against a Devilish Poyson, or a scriptural answer to an antiscriptural and heretical pamphlet, entituled,* A Designed End to the Socinian Controversie, written by John Smith. *Answered by Francis Gregory, D. D. and Rector of Hambleden in the County of Bucks.* London. 8vo. pp. 359.—1696.

Of Dr. Gregory *Wood* has given the following account. (Athen. Oxon. *Fasti* ii. 146.)

"Francis Gregory of St. Mary's Hall was created D. D. Sept. 12, 1661. This person was born at Woodstock, educated in grammar learning in the College School at Westminster, in academical at Cambridge, whence he returned to Westminster, and was an usher under Mr. Richard Busby. Afterwards he became master of the free school in the town of his nativity, and at length the first master of the free school founded at Witney, after his majesty's restoration. At both which places, continuing several years, he did much good by his sedulous instruction. In 1672, or thereabouts, he became rector of Hambleton, near Great Wycomb in Bucks, and about that time one of his majesty's chaplains in ordinary. He hath written (1) *Etymologicum parvum,* &c. *in usum Schol. pub. Westmin.* Lond. 1654. 8vo. (2) Instructions concerning the Art of Oratory, 1659. (3) *Nomenclatura brevis Anglo-Latina-Græca.* (4) Examples of the Five Declensions of Nouns. (5) *Votirum Carolo:* or a welcome to his sacred majesty Charles II. 1660. This book consists of several copies of verses mostly made by Mr. Gregory, and some by his scholars at Woodstock. (6) The Tryal of Religions, with cautions to the members of the Reformed Church against defection to the Roman. 1674. (7) The Grand Presumption of the Roman Church in equalling their traditions to the written Word; and their jealousies of themselves in refusing to admit the Holy Scriptures as the rule for the tryal of their religion. 1675. (8) Discourse upon the Manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles. 1678. He hath also extant [among other sermons] (2) The *Gregorian Account,* or the *Spiritual Watch,* preached to the society of the *Gregories,* dwelling in and about the city of London, and assembled in the church of St. Michael's, Cornhill, 19th of June, 1673, on Mark xiii. 37. (5) *The Religious Villain,* preached before Sir Robert Clayton, Lord Mayor of London, and the Court of Aldermen, 5th Nov. 1679, on 2 Samuel xix. 3. 1680. This Dr. Gregory is now (1695) living at Hambleton, free from the noise of a school."

In Lycons' *Magna Brittannia* (i. 569) there is noticed as "in the parish church of Hambleden a tablet for Dr. Francis Gregory, rector, who died in 1707."

As mottos to the title-page of the *Divine Antidote* are 2 Pet. ii. 1. Ephes. iv. 14, and a Latin sentence from Augustine, expressing that the faithful believe not heretics, but are curious to know what may be replied to them. Also a sentence in Greek, of Epiphanius, ascribing every heresy to an evil disposition and blindness, inflicted by the devil.

From these ornaments of his title-page and the profusion of Greek and Latin quotation from the fathers, in his preface and throughout the work, I am ready to suspect Dr. Gregory of a design to overwhelm John Smith with learned lore, since he had discoverd him to be only an "illiterate mechanic." But let us hear the learned doctor himself, in his address

To the Christian Reader.

"To shake the faith, and stagger the minds of orthodox Christians, touching the doctrine of the glorious Trinity, there came out a little book, which by mere accident I met with. A book stuffed with blasphemous falsehoods, too much magnifying humane reason, abusing the sacred word of God, denying the divinity of Christ, and the personality of the Holy Ghost. What censure its author deserves, let authority judge; but I will venture to say that the *book* itself doth both *deserve* and *need* the flames; for 'tis so abominably foul, that nothing can purge it, save only that which consumes it too. This book was first put into my hand by an eminent citizen of London, who informed me, 'that its author is by trade a clockmaker.' This being so, it may be thought a matter of no great credit for a divine of the Church of England to dispute a point of faith against an illiterate mechanic." The doctor reverts to the occupation of John Smith in the Introduction p. 5. After mentioning "Ebion, and besides him that villian Cerinthus, who held and endeavoured to propagate the same cursed opinion," he asks who is "this very assuming Socinian champion?—he calls himself, if his printer do not nickname him, John Smith, and truly, as the poet observes, *conveniunt rebus nomina sæpe suis*, this person's name is apposite enough, and somewhat of kin to his occupation; for I am informed this great undertaker and reconciler is by trade a clockmaker, and therefore a man, in all probability, who never had any thing of a liberal and learned education; perhaps indeed some little skill in the *mathematicks* may be useful to him in framing a clock, but in his managing this great controverted point of divinity, as we do not expect any *mathematical;* so neither can we find any *logical* demonstration." Our learned doctor presently admires the "unparallell'd presumption of an illiterate mechanick, who should rather handle the smith's hammer than the scholar's pen." He adds, "since in this unhappy age of ours, we have good store of lay-preachers—who without any steps and university degrees *per saltum* leap from the shopboard into the minister's pulpit—whether our clockmaker be a preacher or not, I cannot tell."

Dr. Gregory is a polemic of the school of South rather than of Tillotson. During more than a century, elapsed since his publication, he has scarcely been excelled if even equalled as a coiner of opprobrious epithets. Observing his talent for calling names, I have taken the trouble to collect them, and find that in the course of this volume, John Smith is invested with the following titles.

"Heretical clockmaker—great pretender—subtle sophist—illiterate mechanic—foolish Socinian author — Socinian scribbler — blind beetle—apron schoolman—mechanic divine—trifling scribbler—rank Socinian—bold mechanic—mighty sophister—mighty disputant—confident heretic—our clockmaker—doting scribbler—double heretic—bold author—Socinian babbler—Socinian pamphleteer—presuming mechanic."

Besides these comprehensive appellations John Smith is described as "unexpectedly started up, though not dropt down, from the clouds:—a sorry artist if the works of his *hand*, in his own craft, be not far better than this of his *head*, if he do not use his common *tools* much better than his *pen;* and if the motions of his springs, wheels and clocks, be not more regular and true than the arguments and assertions of his book." His book is called a blasphemous libel which "does highly deserve the flames, what censure soever this *author* may deserve as to his person." He is charged with "barefaced impudence." Of "learned men," whom Dr. Gregory has quoted against John Smith, the doctor says, "if we shall put them and him into an equal ballance, their judgment will as much outweigh his, as Bow bell, or Great Tom of Lincoln, or Christ church in Oxford, would outweigh the least bell in any of this man's clocks."

On this "sorry pamphlet" are charged "impertinent cavils—assertions false and impudent—such an high degree of blasphemy as no good man would be guilty of for all the world." This "Socinian author, proceeding without any method" is "a man who scarce brings one probable argument—an Antinomian as well as a Socinian"—a "worthy gentleman," and a "seraphical divine," yet, by unavoidable inference, a "saucy wretch," and one who "wants and deserves a room in Bethlehem, or in some other madhouse."

The learned Dr. Gregory, though he has so often referred to the reputed occupation of John Smith, cannot quit that favourite subject. He is indeed as fond of clocks as Charles V. in his monastery, though unhappily the Dr. does not appear, like the emperor, to have learned from them the folly of intolerance, for in his preface he quotes with approbation the "imperial laws" against heretics, and especially the following:—"If any Manichee be seen within the Roman empire let him lose his head." He however affects to part friendly with John Smith. After advising him "not to prefer the private opinions of a *few* particular men above the *general judgment* of the Catholic church," he thus addresses him, at the close of his postcript.

"And now for a farewell, let me recommend to you that counsel of the Roman orator—*artem, quam quisque novit, eam exerceat*, and those vulgar proverbial speeches, *ne sutor ultra crepidam*, and *tractent fabritia fabri*, since the wisdom of nations is said to lie much in their proverbs, it will be your prudence to govern yourself by these; the meaning whereof is this: that every man should exercise that art only which he well understands; that a shoemaker should not presume to go beyond his last; that a smith should deal with those materials and tools only, which are proper for his vocation. And since your name is Smith, and as I am credibly informed, your employment, being that of a clockmaker, is somewhat suitable thereunto; you may do well to lay aside the use of pen, ink, and paper, in order to the writing of books; and to take up the hammer, or use the anvil; to mind the springs, wheels and movements of your clocks; to leave the interpretation of scriptures, and the decision of controversies, to learned men who are able to manage them a great deal better."

Whether Dr. Gregory proved himself, on this occasion, one of those *learned men*, or whether John Smith does not appear in the comparison to have been a *scribe well instructed*, and if he really were a mechanic and illiterate, yet scripturally *learn'd without the schools*, I shall enquire in my next number.

VERMICULUS.

Mr. Palmer on the Appellation "Socinian."

Hackney, Nov. 10, 1813.

Sir,

The reviewer of my pamphlet in your last number does not, in my apprehension, give a fair or correct view of my argument; and many of my readers, both orthodox and heterodox, differ from him in their opinion of the publication, thinking that I have fully proved my point, that "Dr. Watts was not a *Socinian*," nor, in your sense of the term, a *Unitarian*. I mean not, however, to occupy any of your pages with a controversy on the subject, but shall content myself with referring the matter to the impartial judgment of such of your readers as have seen or may yet see my performance. If any one of them should think fit to answer it, with his name, I may possibly attempt a defence, with the addition of something that I have in reserve, or confess myself mistaken.

All that I at present intend is, to offer a few words to vindicate the application of the term *Socinian* to your "sect." It is never used by me as "a term of reproach," nor do I think it often is by others. And why it should be "offensive" to any of you I cannot conceive. Though you differ in some particulars from *Socinus*, his character is still in high estimation among you. See his Life by Dr. Toulmin. What though he believed *more* than you do, it cannot for that reason be reproachful to you to be called by his name. Indeed your difference from him is only in some of the least considerable points: as to the capital articles in which he differed from the generality of Christians in his day, you agree with him.

Upon the principle of your reviewer, and some of your correspondents, scarcely any denomination of professing Christians can with propriety be called after their leaders. Very few, for instance, of those called *Arians* (a term which your writers often use) will allow, I presume, that they entirely agree with *Arius*. Nor will the modern *Calvinists* subscribe to every thing maintained by *John Calvin*, though they are far from thinking his name "a reproach." Why then should your "sect" (I mean no *offence* by that term which you often adopt) be so much offended at being called *Socinians?* Be assured, there is no danger of its being misunderstood, to your disadvantage, since it is generally known that you do not "idolize Christ," as Socinus is said to have done. And the objection that the term is "ambiguous" is altogether groundless, since every one knows what is meant by it.

Your friends chuse rather to be called *Unitarians*. But this appellation cannot be yielded up to them, because this certainly is *ambiguous*. Accordingly Mr. Merrival noticed it in his correspondence with Dr. Lardner, who did not vouchsafe to satisfy him in what sense he used it with respect to Dr. Watts. (See the quotation at the close of your review of Mr. Lindsey's Life.) Though it is true all Socinians are Unitarians, the term cannot be appropriated to them exclusively, since there are other sects who claim it, and have an equal right to it. Yours' therefore must be content to be called Socinians till they contrive some other name which shall be expressive of their distinguishing opinions, and then the former shall no longer be used by your respectful correspondent.

S. PALMER.

Strictures on a recent publication of Mr. Palmer's. No. I.

Sir, *Nov. 2d,* 1813.

I cannot be astonished that different religious societies are eager for the honour of enrolling under their several banners the name of Dr. Watts. "Such he was," said Johnson, "as every Christian church would rejoice to have adopted." Yet while I give full credit to Mr. Palmer* for the sincerity and zeal with which he enters on the task of vindicating the suspected orthodoxy of a favourite divine, I cannot compliment him on the success of his undertaking. He stumbles at the very threshold. His title-page is at once needlessly offensive and glaringly incorrect. Who has affirmed that Dr. Watts was a *Socinian?* Lardner attests that "the last sentiments" of this very excellent man, "were completely *Unitarian:*" and what Lardner meant by *Unitarian*—how carefully and precisely he discriminated between the opinions so denominated and those which characterized *Socinus* and the Polish brethren—is evident to every reader of his works.† Nor is Watts classed by Mr. Belsham,‡ among Socinians. The catch-words therefore which stand at the head of Mr. Palmer's pamphlet, have no just relation to the matter in dispute. If this gentleman plead (27) that the term Socinian is less ambiguous than Unitarian, I must deny the fact. Mr. Palmer is accurately acquainted (few men more so) with the appellations by which the respective bodies of professing Christians are distinguished: he is aware (no man more perfectly‖) that the attempt to fix upon any one of those bodies a denomination which they disavow, which they maintain to be altogether inappropriate, and which in most instances has an invidious object and application, is a species of persecution. Granting that he has proved Dr. Watts to have been no Socinian, he has not, of course proved, in contradiction to Lardner, that he was no Unitarian. Undoubtedly, there is a description of persons who will take a livelier interest in this series of letters, when they glance on the sentence in the very front of it; upon this set of men, the slaves of ignorance and prejudice, wonders are wrought by the magic energy of names; hence the antipathies of some and the prepossessions of others are awakened in a moment. But these, I presume, are not the readers on whose favour Mr. Palmer calculates, and to whom he addresses his theological and literary labours.

On consulting a former publication of this gentleman's§ I learn that a writer in the *Monthly Review,* Feb. 1782, had spoken of Dr. Watts's change of opinion, "with respect to some points of what is called *orthodoxy,* as undeniable," as "well known" to Lardner, and by him communicated to the late excellent Mr. Merivale of Exeter, from whose mouth "the reviewer immediately received it." This identical communication to Mr. M. it would seem, has recently been printed, for the first time, in Belsham's Memoirs of Mr. Lindsey. As it was extracted thence in a late number of the *Repository,* there is no necessity for my transcribing it: though the date of it does not appear, and though I am neither able nor concerned to say why Dr. Priestley (8) withheld from the world the letter of Mr. Merivale's in which it is contained, I, nevertheless, without hesitation, admit its genuineness. My present inquiry will be, whether Mr. Palmer has invalidated the testimony of Lardner: and I shall hope to shew hereafter that it is confirmed by strong presumptive evidence arising from passages and documents in the worthy author's pamphlets on this subject.

---

* See his recent pamphlet entitled "Dr. Watts no Socinian."

† See especially vol. x. 619, &c.

‡ Memoirs of Lindsey, 217.

‖ Postcript, 44, 45.

§ Life of Watts by Dr. Johnson, with Notes, &c. 96, &c.

He has presented "The Rev. Joseph Smith, of Manchester," and the public with five letters. The first is introductory. In the second and third an attempt is made to repel Dr. Lardner's testimony as insufficient: and positive evidence of the orthodoxy of Watts is professedly adduced in the fourth and fifth.

All the objections, Mr. Editor, which the Letter-writer urges against the testimony of Lardner, may be resolved into the following: that this witness had not read *the whole* of Dr. Watts's manuscripts; that his communication to Mr. Merivale is destitute of accuracy and precision; that the substance of it is little more than positive assertion made and repeated; that it is far from being decisive of Watts having renounced the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence; that it leads to some conclusions which the character of this celebrated man refutes; that it is not consistent with two books which he printed within that number of years of his decease, with information sent by Dr. Jennings to Dr. Doddridge, and with other facts and dates; that the worthy family with whom Dr. Watts resided, did not understand that he was become an Unitarian; and that Mr. Neal (partial to his own opinion, as he was in the sentiments of his uncle Lardner) would naturally make the most of what dropped from the lips of Dr. Watts.

(1.) It is alleged (14) that Lardner "had not read ALL Dr. Watts's M.SS. for he says that his nephew only shewed him SOME of them, consequently he can scarcely be admitted as a thoroughly competent judge."

Now, Sir, the decision of the author of the *Credibility, &c.* on this matter, was formed not merely from those of the M.SS. which he had read, but, moreover, from his conversations with his near relation Mr. Neal, who was one of the executors, who had possession of the papers, who, doubtless, was well acquainted with their contents, and who, though he did not "chuse to meddle with them"* just upon the death of

---

* Palmer's Appendix to Johnson's Life of Watts.

Watts, afterwards submitted them to the inspection and disposal of the Drs. Jennings and Doddridge. Mr. Palmer himself has not seen ALL the M.SS. of this popular divine. Yet from SOME which have subsequently been laid before the world, he infers, in his Letters (31, 32) and in another work†, that the Doctor's unpublished papers afford much "the same explanations of the Deity of Christ and the Spirit" with those given in the pieces which he himself last printed. "The sum of which is that Christ is a divine person in consequence of the in-dwelling of the Father, and that the Holy Spirit is God, as being the power or active energy of the Deity."‡ But had not Lardner an equal right with his censor to deduce an inference concerning the tenor of *all* the M.SS. from his perusal of *some* of them, —such, for example, as the *Solemn Address, &c.?* Thus far at least, is *he* not as "thoroughly competent a judge?"

(2) "These letters of Dr. Lardner," adds Mr. P. (14) "are not written in a manner very creditable to him, but discover something like that *imbecility* which he reports of Dr. Watts. They are certainly destitute of that accuracy and precision by which his writings in general are distinguished, so that it is not easy to gather any clear consistent ideas from them."

The testimony of this respectable man, I admit, is concise; for it is a simple statement of what he believed to be a fact. Even Mr. Palmer acknowledges (p. 1,) that it is "accompanied with circumstantial evidence;" and where is the difficulty of gaining "clear, consistent ideas" from the declaration that "Dr. Watts's last thoughts were completely Unitarian?" Who can doubt that Lardner affixed an *accurate* and *precise* sense to the word, and never confounded it with the term *Socinian?*

(3) But we are told (ib.) that "the PROOF of what he asserts is very defective. Here is little more than positive assertion made and repeated that Dr. Watts was an Unitarian, without defining the sense, in which (as Mr. Merivale justly observed) there is some ambiguity."

"Mr. Merivale was very well aware in how strict a sense the Doctor* generally used it." Why then should he have suspected that his correspondent deviated from this strictness in the present instance? Or why should Mr. Palmer, who can be no stranger to Lardner's writings, consider the word Unitarian as ambiguous? At any rate, it is equivalent, in this connection, with Antitrinitarian; though the very valuable person upon whom the ambiguity is charged, was accustomed to employ the name in a less general signification.

(4) In the letter writer's judgment, Dr. Lardner's testimony is far from being decisive of Watts having given up the tenet of Christ's pre-existence (15). Surely, even the former of the two communications should have obviated all doubts upon this point. Mr. Merivale having mentioned, in his correspondence with Lardner, the difficulty of fixing his

---

† Appendix, &c.

‡ Ib.

* Lardner.

own sentiments with regard to the person of Christ, though he had before thought the doctrine of his pre-existence sufficiently proved by Dr. Clarke, Dr. Watts, and others, his venerable friend replies, "I think Dr. Watts never was an Arian, to his honour be it spoken." (9) This answer, Sir, taken in connection with the sentences preceding it, appears to me abundantly explicit and satisfactory. However, as Mr. M. was desirous of still further information, and a yet stronger assurance, Lardner opens to him the sources whence the intelligence had flowed, namely, Mr. Neal's conversation and hi own perusal of some of the M.SS. Supported by this evidence, he hesitates not to affirm, DR. WATTS'S LAST THOUGHTS WERE COMPLETELY UNITARIAN.

It is not a little remarkable, Mr. Editor, that the *Solemn Address*, &c. maintains a profound silence concerning the pre-existence of Jesus Christ (12). This most interesting composition Mr. Palmer reprinted in his edition of Johnson's Life of Watts: and it may well afford occasion for several observations, and awaken many a tender sentiment in the feeling mind. At a future time, I shall assign reasons for believing that this paper and one or two of a similar complexion, which have not seen the light, were *some* of the manuscripts perused by Dr. Lardner, and that to these he principally referred. For the present, I content myself with quoting from the *Solemn Address*, &c. the following sentences on the person of our Lord.

"I believe thy only Son Jesus Christ to be all-sufficient for the glorious work of mediation between God and man, to which thou hast appointed him. I believe he is a man, in whom dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. I believe he is one with God; he is God manifested in the flesh; and that the man *Jesus* is so closely and inseparately united with the true and eternal Godhead, as to become one person, even as the soul and body make one man."†

I invite the readers of Mr. Palmer's pamphlet to compare this extract with Dr. Lardner's testimony. Although the language of Watts may not be technically correct, it is clear enough that he was in truth no Trinitarian. Nor is this theology *Arianism* in any of its modifications.

(5) Was Dr. Watts then an Unitarian (in Mr. Palmer's less accurate phraseology a *Socinian*) without his knowledge? "Can a severer reflection," asks this author, "be cast upon his understanding?" (20) There would be some pertinency in the question, if the world had never heard of men of acknowledged talents, of freedom of inquiry, and of exemplary diligence, who, nevertheless, inconsciously embraced sentiments which they fondly endeavoured to reconcile to the prejudices and feelings of their earlier years, and to the popular names indicating which they expressed a great dislike "and even horror." This is no uncommon case; and it has been well stated and applied by Mr. Belsham in a passage the greater part of which is cited in these Letters (19, 20).

But Watts had an "allowed aversion to Socinianism;" and "I should think it most natural," reasons his vindicator (20), "to infer that he was far from embracing it." *Parcior esto*: the words Socinianism and Socinian, Mr. Palmer knows, have long been employed as theological scarecrows: and that man has no very intimate acquaintance with his own mind and with human nature, who is ignorant that our antipathies to names, are among the last which we overcome. To proper Socinianism—the thing no less than the denomination—Dr. Watts might, not improbably, be averse: nor have we evidence that he adopted the characteristic opinions of Socinus and his followers. Now, "the Unitarian system," Sir, does not comprehend those opinions; it was taught and received centuries before they had an existence. And, were it not illogical and invidious to compare with Deism (21) any system including a belief in revelation, I might add that the professor of Unitarianism has not more sentiments than the Calvinist* in common with a Deist.

---

† Life of Watts, &c. (1785) 103.

If Dr. Watts, argues Mr. P. (16), "had become a complete Unitarian, and had he been very desirous to promote that opinion, he would have been very explicit in renouncing his former sentiments on these points, and very full in stating his objections against them; indeed, as an honest man, he should have given positive orders to his executors to publish what he had written on these his *new* sentiments, which it is plain from his will he did not."

We renounce error, Mr. Editor, when we state and defend truth. The contents of the *Solemn Address*, &c. are a sufficient proof of the honesty of Watts's mind. It is a "very explicit" and "very full" disclosure of those objections by which he was affected. But to oppose the direct testimony of Lardner by speculations upon what Dr. Watts *might* or *should* have done, is not to reason legitimately and conclusively.

(6) This testimony is further pronounced inconsistent with two books which Dr. W. printed within the same number of years of his decease (10, 21). And it is readily conceded, Sir, that, according to the analysis of these works which Mr. Palmer has given in his notes on Johnson's Life of Watts,* *the pre-existence of Christ's human soul* is there asserted. But the inquiry before us, we should always remember, is, what were the *last* thoughts of this celebrated nonconformist divine? Now I am as much at liberty to assume that the *Solemn Address*, &c. was drawn up *after* the publication of the *Important Questions*, &c. and the *Glory of Christ*, &c. as the author of the Letters is to take for granted that it had a *prior* date. The truth is that the *Address* was framed by Dr. Watts on a *review* of what he had written in the Controversy. In *this* therefore we are far more likely to discover his *last* thoughts than in any former piece, not to insist on the more than possibility of his changing his sentiments within even two years. If these three documents be carefully examined and mutually compared, the comparison will corroborate instead of impugning the testimony of Lardner.

---

* Mon. Rep. viii. 300.

* 57—91.

(8) "But it so happens," subjoins Mr. P. (22) "that we have decisive proof that what Dr. Watts wrote and left in manuscript, on the points about which he had given up his early opinions, was written *some years before his decease.* For the proof of this I refer to a letter of Dr. Jennings to Dr. Doddridge, in which he says, "I believe we shall not have near so much trouble in publishing the Doctor's M.SS. as I expected, when he acquainted me with his design of committing them in part to my care, *which was three or four years ago.*' He adds, 'for since then he has published most of the M.SS. he designed for the press.' These were doubtless the two volumes mentioned above, both of which are dated 1746" (23).

This argument is urged by the letter-writer with apparent triumph. To convert it into *decisive proof,* he should have shewn, first, that by *most* of the M.SS. Dr. Jennings meant ALL OF THEM; next, that "the two volumes mentioned above," included most of those M.SS. and lastly, that it was utterly improbable Watts should have written any thing on the subject of the Trinity at a yet more advanced period of his life. As long as the *Solemn Address,* &c. is in existence, the probability will be on the other side.

(8) Still Mr. Palmer cannot reconcile Lardner's testimony with other facts and dates: I will quote his own words (10):

"Dr. Lardner says that Dr. Watts was a Unitarian several years before his death. This does not agree with the most prevalent report, which is that he changed his sentiments but a few years before he died, and this, if he became a Unitarian at all, is by far the most probable."

On this step of the reasoning I shall only observe that the express testimony of such a man as Lardner, is, in my eyes, highly deserving of regard, even though it contradict "the most prevalent report." Are there not numerous cases in which Mr. Palmer declines giving to report the name of evidence?

He goes on (ib.)——"it is an undeniable fact that Dr. Watts himself published several things upon this very subject, viz. the Trinity and the person of Christ, within the two last years of his life, and it is incredible that in these his Unitarianism should not have appeared, especially if he was so very desirous, as is said, to promote that opinion."

For several years, as is admitted on both hands, Watts had thought and written and printed much on the Trinitarian controversy. It is further agreed that his opinions respecting this doctrine, had varied for some time from the popular ideas. Now, in perfect consistence with this representation and with a strict examination of the books which he composed and published, Lardner states that for several years Dr. Watts had been an Unitarian, but that his *last* thoughts were *completely Unitarian.*

But why, Mr. Palmer should ask (11) did Dr. Lardner approve the suppression of the posthumous papers? Why does he exculpate the executors, who did not think them "fit for publication?"

My answer is in Lardner's own language: "I was of opinion," he remarks to his nephew (13), "that Dr. Watts was unable to recommend his new sentiments to the public, because he had never been used to a proper way of reasoning on such a subject. So it proved."

The meaning of this last sentence Mr. Palmer does not comprehend. But I am astonished that he should feel any difficulty in understanding it. Mr. Merivale's correspondent declares that the fact was agreeable to his conjectures; he believed that Watts "had never been used to a proper way of reasoning on such a subject:" and the sight of the papers confirmed his judgment.

Very eminent as were the learning and assiduity, the genius and talents of Dr. Watts, it is certain that in closeness of scriptural research and reasoning on the person of Christ, he is extremely inferior to Lardner. A comparison of the celebrated *Letter on the Logos* with any one of Watts's publications in this controversy, will decide the point. Lardner, free from the fetters of human schemes and systems, interprets scripture by scripture; while the great and good man with whom I am contrasting him, is principally employed in an attempt to reconcile offensive sentiments to popular phraseology. The one writes with the rational confidence of a man who has discovered truth in all its beautiful simplicity; in the other I perceive a devout and virtuous, an inquisitive and candid mind struggling with the prejudices of early youth. Though I heartily wish that all his M.SS. had been printed, I cannot wonder at so accomplished a divine as Lardner affirming that Dr. Watts had never been used to a proper way of reasoning on such a subject, and was therefore unable to recommend his sentiments to the world: his powers were various and superior; but it was not in controversial theology that he displayed his strength.

(9) That the worthy family with whom he resided did not suppose that he was become an Unitarian (25), may be allowed. They might not have read *all* or *most* of his M.SS. and even if they had, they were not "so thoroughly competent judges" of their contents as Lardner.

(10) Nor can I discover any good cause of arraigning Mr. Neal's judgment or impartiality in this affair (25, 26). Does a man's *partiality* to his own *opinion*, incapacitate him for being a *witness* to a *fact*? The common rules of evidence, Mr. Editor, must be set aside before this principle can be established. Neal's testimony to the Unitarianism of Watts and Hopton Haynes's to that of Sir Isaac Newton, are in vain attempted to be overthrown by the consideration of their own religious sentiments; for it will surely be granted, that notwithstanding they were Unitarians, they were honest men. The intellectual and moral qualities of Mr. Neal, appear indeed to have been of no vulgar order; and his letters to Dr. Doddridge, are perhaps the best in the Collection published by Mr. Stedman.

Mr. P. opposes to Lardner's testimony that of Mr. Joseph Parker, of the late Mrs. Abney, of Dr. Gibbons and of Dr. Stennett. He further places stress on the epitaph which Dr. Watts ordered to be inscribed upon his tombstone, on the funeral discourse for him delivered by Dr. Jennings, on the *Solemn Address* and on a tract of which a small edition, said to have been published during Watt's life, was soon suppressed, but which was reprinted in 1802 (27, &c.).

The testimony of Mr. Parker and of Mrs. Abney, both of them very excellent persons, is not yet distinctly before us: I conclude therefore that it was *negative*: (25) nor can it weigh against the *positive* and repeated declarations of a man so eminent as Lardner not only for the compass and accuracy of his theological knowledge, but for the strictness of his regard to truth. Dr. Gibbons's relation is partly original, partly hearsay evidence. So far as it contains his own observations, it is vague, general and unsatisfactory: and Mr. Palmer, who seems fully sensible of it's insufficiency "to furnish a decisive argument in the present case" (28, note), endeavours to compensate for its imperfection by adding to it what he "received from the person himself alluded to" by Gibbons, "the late Dr. Stennet, who in conversing with the letter-writer on Dr. Watts's last sentiments, said they had been much misrepresented; for so far from having embraced the Socinian system, he expressed his firm belief of the doctrine of Christ's atonement, and lamented, even with tears that so many should have given it up; with more to the same purpose."

There are so many theories, Sir, of what Mr. Palmer styles the doctrine of Christ's *atonement*, that, in every instance where the word is undefined, we are left to conjecture what a firm belief in it comprehends. This author knows that the phraseology itself is destitute of countenance from the Christian scriptures, and that the original term ought to have been translated *reconciliation*: nor is there any class of professors of the gospel who embrace with greater cordiality than Unitarians the assurance that *God is in Christ* RECONCILING *the world to himself*. 2 Cor. v. 19.

The epitaph that Dr. Watts ordered to be inscribed on his tomb, was, *In Uno Jesu omnia.*

These words appear to have been suggested by Rom. viii. 32: and an Unitarian could employ them with as much justness and interest as a Trinitarian; though not in exactly the same signification.

Zealous as was Dr. Jennings in his attachment to the orthodox faith, he could not however be insensible to the great and amiable qualities of Watts. Even on the supposition that his friend had departed totally, or in a high degree from the popular creed, what should prevent him from still being his warm and eloquent panegyrist? Unless it can be proved that it was impossible for Jennings to unite *orthodoxy* and *charity*, the strain of his funeral sermon for Dr. W. cannot counterbalance direct testimony.

It may be true, Sir, that no marks of the Socinianism of Watts are contained in the *Solemn Address, &c.* But then it is equally true that no persons, whose judgment is of any estimation, call him a *Socinian*. The evidence alleged to arise from his two publications, in 1746, I have already noticed.

The tract reprinted in 1802, was, on Mr. Palmer's own shewing (34), prior to these: there is therefore no pretence for saying or insinuating that it records the *last* thoughts of Dr. Watts. But to this document, and to some other pieces analyzed or quoted by the letter-writer, I shall give particular attention in the following Number, and shall thus, I flatter myself, unquestionably prove, that his *glorying is not good.*

I am, Sir,
Your's, &c.
N.

Mr. Belsham's Reply to the Rev. H. Horsley.

LETTER VII.

Essex-Street, Nov. 4, 1813.

SIR,

I flatter myself that enough has been advanced in the preceding Letters to evince the justice and impartiality of the Review of the celebrated controversy between Dr. Horsley and Dr. Priestley, which is annexed to the first part of the Calm Inquiry into the Scripture Doctrine concerning the person of Christ. And I am persuaded, that notwithstanding all the *ingentia verba* of the reverend prebendary it has been made evident to your attentive and impartial readers, that the learned prelate did upon the authority of Mosheim impeach the character of Origen, and that when called upon for his proofs he failed to substantiate his charge—that, notwithstanding the reverend prebendary's assertion to the contrary, the bishop did, by his own confession, borrow every circumstance which he has related concerning an orthodox church of Hebrew Christians at Ælia, from Mosheim, excepting some *necessary circumstances* which he himself added to *help out the broken story*—that being urged to produce his authorities from antiquity, he found that those appealed to by Mosheim would by no means bear him out in his narrative, that the testimony of Sulpicius Severus proved nothing, that Orosius was a *feather in the scale*, and that the passsage from Epiphanius was so truly absurd and irrelevant that he did not think proper even to translate it into English. It has been further made evident, beyond contradiction, that the bishop, discarding all these authorities, produces original evidence of his own to establish the existence of an orthodox church at Ælia, consisting of Hebrew Christians, who had abandoned the rites of the law to participate in the privileges of the Ælian colony—that this proof consists of six gratuitous propositions which, by the right reverend author's own confession, only prove the possibility of the supposed fact; that, to complete the proof therefore, he adds a seventh proposition, in which, from the mention which Jerome makes of "Hebrews believing in Christ," in his time, he argues that a body of orthodox Hebrew Christians existed at Ælia in the time of Adrian. (Tracts, p. 419.) And finally, that being duly sensible that this assumption was rather a large stride to so important a conclusion, the learned prelate frankly owns in his sixth disquisition, that "St. Jerome's evidence proves nothing more than that a body of orthodox Christians of the Hebrews actually existed in the world in his day, that it is *brought for this position singly*:

and that the existence of the church at Ælia in the reign of Adrian, depends upon the six first propositions." Those very propositions concerning which he had before expressly said, "they amount not to a proof that a church of Hebrew Christians, not adhering to the rites of Judaism, actually existed at Ælia." p. 417.

The attentive reader will easily conceive, that to such an argument it was not very difficult for the bishop's active and learned opponent to make a triumphant reply, which he concludes by loudly challenging his right reverend antagonist to meet him again in the field of controversy. But the case was now altered: *Ille ibit quo vis qui zonam perdidit.* The bishop observed a discreet silence. And both the combatants retired from the hard fought action well, if not equally well, content with the result of the conflict: Dr. Priestley with his VICTORY, and Dr. Horsley with his MITRE.

Thus far the reverend prebendary attends the statement of the Calm Inquirer with something which he dignifies with the name of argument; with what success, the attentive reader may judge. Either from confidence or despair he now withdraws from the pursuit. And indeed he acknowledges with great frankness and naiveté, p. 591, "Of the remainder of Mr. B's. arguments against Mosheim and the bishop, I confess that I can make nothing." A confession to which the intelligent reader will give easy credit, considering how little the reverend gentleman has made of those arguments which he has already examined. But let not the good-natured reader imagine that he gives up the cause though he abandons the argument. He has another weapon at hand in the management of which *his great strength lies:* and in which his adversary is no match for him: it is that of sarcasm, abuse and calumny. In which he resembles the great Napoleon, who, if he cannot beat the Crown Prince, can at least hire his scribblers to rail at him. It may not be amiss to conclude this correspondence, by exhibiting a few specimens of this mode of attack, by which the reader may judge of the gentle spirit with which this pious ecclesiastic conducts the controversy.

The worthy prebendary admits, p. 591, that the Calm Inquirer, "occasionally differs from Dr. Priestley." This is a testimony to the impartiality of the reviewer, the more to be valued as it is extorted from an enemy. It proves at least that the Inquirer is not the blind admirer of his acute and learned friend. The worthy gentleman gravely adds, that "these differences certainly add nothing to the force of the Doctor's original reasoning." Indeed, Sir, it was not expected that they would. The design of the Reviewer was not to act the part of an advocate, but of a candid and impartial judge.

"He contrives however," continues the reverend prebendary, "to weaken the bishop's reasoning by *making him occasionally say what he has not said,* and quoting partially what he has said." To the latter part of the charge, the Reviewer must plead guilty, as it was by no means his intention to transcribe the whole of the bishop's work. To the former he can only oppose an unqualified denial, challenging the reverend gentleman to produce his proof, or to submit to the disgrace of having advanced an accusation which he was unable to substantiate. But the venerable ecclesiastic is not backward to produce proof how shamefully the reviewer has misrepresented the sentiments of the learned prelate. In page 599 he mentions an ancient tract, *soi-disant* the epistle of Barnabas, which the bishop does not attribute to the apostle, but appeals to it as the production of some orthodox Hebrew Christian of the apostolic age. And the reverend prebendary grievously complains that though "Mr. B. does not *directly* charge the bishop with having attributed it to any undue authority, yet the manner in which he labours to set aside its evidence, must lead the unthinking multitude, who have never looked into the bishop's tracts, to *imagine that he considers it as the work of an inspired apostle.*"

Now, Sir, what is it that Mr. B. has said, which can possibly lead the *unthinking multitude* to conclude that the bishop considered that notable epistle as the work of an inspired apostle? The following are his very words, extracted, you will hardly believe it, from the prebendary's own book, p. 600, the page immediately following that in which the charge is brought. "The epistle of Barnabas," says Mr. B. which, though it is admitted *not to have been written by the companion of St. Paul*, the learned writer contends to have been a production of the apostolic age, and addressed by a Hebrew Christian to his Jewish brethren." These are Mr. B's words. And yet he is charged with insinuating that the bishop attributed this epistle to an inspired apostle. Surely, this cannot be the allegation of a *sober* critic.

The reverend prebendary condescends to carp at words. The reviewer states that Dr. Priestley's reply sufficiently *impeaches* the testimony of the pseudo-Barnabas. The expression is inadvertent and inaccurate. It would have been better to have said, that the reply affords *sufficient ground for impeaching*, or that it sufficiently *invalidates* the testimony of Barnabas. A candid critic would have so understood it. But our literary champion triumphs mightily in the discovery of this verbal incorrectness. Nor is he indeed to be too severely censured. Since he finds that he can make nothing of arguments, who can blame him for making the most he can of words?

Our reverend prebendary is not however always equally successful in his verbal distinctions, and is himself occasionally chargeable with inaccurate phraseology. He accuses the calm inquirer of applying to Bishop Horsley such epithets as *ignorant* and *pitiful*. Tracts, p. 612. Most certainly had the reviewer of the controversy applied such epithets to the learned prelate *generally*, he would have richly deserved the rebuke which the reverend prebendary so justly applies to those who call Origen a liar, viz. that "he would excite against himself the indignation of every man of letters." But of this offence against the reputation of an able and a learned man, the reviewer's conscience entirely acquits him.

The first of the reverend prebendary's accusations is founded upon nothing more than the hope, which the reviewer expressed, that at the beginning of the controversy, when the bishop had not studied the subject, and relied wholly upon Mosheim, he had *ignorantly* adopted the calumny upon Origen's character from that learned, but partial writer. This the venerable prebendary works up into a charge against the bishop as an ignorant man. "Bishop Horsley ignorant, and Mr. B. learned!"

The second charge, viz. that the Reviewer applies the epithet *pitiful* to Bishop Horsley is totally destitute of foundation. It is indeed true, that the calm inquirer, in his review of the controversy, p. 436, represents his lordship as *piteously* complaining of the uncivil attempt of his merciless adversary to embarrass the question with chronological difficulties, notwithstanding the earnest caveat which he had prudently entered against it. But the reverend prebendary ought to have understood the difference between a *piteous* complaint and a *pitiful* writer. It is possible however, that between his professional enengagements in the mountains of Wales, and his present residence in the Highlands of the North, the pious ecclesiastic may have become more familiar with the Welsh and the Gaelic, than with his native tongue, some of the nicer distinctions of which may have escaped his recollection. In the present case, as the reverend gentleman has an objection to *logical* definitions, a familiar example may perhaps suffice to refresh his memory. An Englishman, who speaks the language correctly, would say, for instance, it is a *piteous* cause which requires misrepresentation to support it, and he is a *pitiful* advocate who can stoop to make use of such a mode of defence.

The reverend prebendary's holy indignation at the reviewer's blasphemous assumption of those divine attributes which he denies to his Saviour, has been noticed in a former letter. The delicacy of his religious feelings seems to have been almost equally hurt at the *profane* allusion which the reviewer makes to a text in John. For the last hypothesis, upon which the bishop builds his church, being that the holy brethren resident at Jerusalem, without taking the trouble of a journey to Pella, entered as colonists at Ælia, only abandoning the rites of Moses, that they might not be known as Jews, the reviewer asks how they could hope to escape detection, and particularly, whether the eyes of the Roman magistrates *were holden so as not to know them.* This allusion to the words of scripture, the reverend prebendary is pleased to stigmatize, p. 593, as "a profane artifice," and "a ludicrous application of one of the proofs of our Lord's resurrection." By the use of scripture language the writer intended no offence. But perhaps it is the first time that the circumstance of the disciples not knowing our Lord when they saw him has been alleged as a proof of his resurrection. This discovery was reserved for the ingenuity of the prebendary of St. Asaph.

The reverend gentleman having charged the reviewer of the controversy with representing the learned prelate as an ignorant and pitiful writer, with equal truth insinuates that the reviewer arrogates to himself the praise of superior learning. "Bishop Horsley ignorant, Mr. Belsham learned." While, at the same time, he insinuates that the reviewer is so wretchedly ignorant that he cannot understand a Greek or Latin author without having recourse to an English or a French translation, which, says this polite writer, (p. 571.) is "the common practice of the most arrogant polemics of the Unitarian school." And who can doubt whether the accuracy of Mr. Prebendary Horsley's information keeps pace with the intrepidity of his assertions? Especially as throughout his vaunting Appendix, he takes frequent occasion to throw out sneers and sarcasms of similar tendency.

If, however, the learning of the reviewer of this famous controversy enables him to shew, beyond contradiction, that the right reverend prelate, who perfectly understood the question, retired from the field conscious of a total defeat, and if it is competent to prove that the well-meaning efforts of the pious prebendary, who undertook, with more zeal than prudence, to vindicate his father's theological fame, have only served to notify his own lamentable ignorance, and to render the learned prelate's failure still more conspicuous, the public can have no further concern in the literary attainments of so obscure an individual as the reviewer of this controversy. Nor can it be of the least moment to any one to ascertain the comparative learning of the contending parties. To depreciate classical literature is very far from the wish, or the intention, of the reviewer. Let it not however be forgotten, that a man may be a profound scholar but a shallow theologian; and that the learning even of a Parr or a Porson can never convert nonsense into sense, nor prove a contradiction to be true.

Yet, after all, let it not be said, that the reverend prebendary accumulates charges without proof. He has caught his luckless adversary upon the horns of a terrible dilemma, from which it appears impossible for him to escape unwounded. Wilful falsehood or gross ignorance are the only alternatives, out of which he is left to make his choice, and the Christian tenderness which so eminently distinguishes the pious ecclesiastic is willing to screen even a *foeman* from the imputation of deliberate untruth. Let him speak for himself. See Tracts, p. 597.

"Though I am as far from suspecting him of a disregard to truth in general, as my father was of suspecting Origen of such disregard, it is impossible to doubt that in the heat of controversy he has, through inattention, no doubt, asserted at least one falsehood as notorious as that of which the bishop accused Origen. In his zeal to degrade the Son of God from the dignity of the Creator to that of a mere man in the creation, he finds the epithet *μονογενης*, which is applied to him by St. John, so much in his way, that to get rid of it, he supposes it to be employed by that apostle in no other sense than as equivalent to *αγαπητος*, *which he boldly affirms does not occur in St. John.* As he is one of the authors of the Improved Version, [*who told the reverend prebendary that?*] we cannot suspect him of having never read the original, or of having read it with so little attention, as to have totally overlooked any thing of importance which it contains. We can only suppose that his mind was so completely occupied by the object of the controversy in which he was engaged with the celebrated Dr. Clarke, [*what can the reverend prebendary mean?*] as to make him lose sight of at least six different sentences in which St. John employs the word *αγαπητος* in the sense in which it is commonly used by other Greek writers." And that the reverend gentleman's ingenuousness may be as conspicuous as his learning and his charity, he frankly confesses that this grand discovery of Mr. B.'s ignorance and falsehood was not his own, but that he retailed it from that oracle of truth and wisdom, the British Critic for January 1812, "to which," says he, "I am indebted for pointing out to me this blunder."

How unfortunate is it that so much learning, so much critical acumen, so much profound research, and what is more than all, so much Christian charity as that which is displayed in the above paragraph and which reflects so much credit upon the reverend prebendary and his worthy coadjutors, the British Critics, should be all lost, and wasted upon a mere shadow. It is grievous to say, but the truth must be told, that Mr. B. never made any such silly unqualified assertion as that which is here imputed to him. Nor any thing like it. And if the worthy gentleman wishes to know what Mr. B. really did say, what can he do better than follow his right reverend father's advice, "*if he be so pleased he may go and seek*," taking this further admonition with him, that it is better to trust to his own enquiries than to the lying reports of mercenary reviewers, and that when a person means to *rebuke* it is commonly advisable that he should *first understand*.

The learned prelate in discussing the testimony of Jeremiah Jones which had been appealed to by Dr. Priestley, has fallen into the common error of confounding him with his relation and tutor the respectable Samuel Jones of Tewkesbury, who kept an academy there, at which bishops Maddox and Butler, archbishop Secker and Dr. Chandler received their education in classics and theology. The reviewer, *en passant*, rectified this error of the bishop's: but though the error is not denied, yet the correction of it cannot escape the reprehension of the pious prebendary. "What this has to do," says he p. 603, "with the question at issue about the deference due to the testimony of St. Barnabas, or of the author assuming that name, I confess myself unable to imagine." What then are the errors of a bishop too sacred to be touched? But it seems that to notice this error was a digression from the subject. And to shew, no doubt, what it is to write connectedly, the reverend prebendary hooks in a long story of good Dr. Buchanan and the India missionaries. p, 596. A common reader would be puzzled to discover the connexion between this modern tale and the orthodox church of Ælia. But Mr. Prebendary Horsley is no common writer, nor does he write for common readers.

The reverend prebendary introduces in p. 595, a quotation from

Dr. Cave's Lives of the Fathers, in which that learned writer appears to think that in a case to which he alludes, Origen's zeal in controversy carried him beyond the strict limits of truth. Had this citation occurred to the bishop he would, no doubt, have made the most of it. As it now stands this article can have no place in a review of the controversy between Bishop Horsley and Dr. Priestley.

To eke out the remainder of his Appendix, for probably it was thought that a dissertation of less than fifty good octavo pages would not be of sufficient consequence to offer to the Prince Regent, the reverend prebendary introduces a long dissertation from Cotelerius and Jeremiah Jones, upon the date and authenticity of that miserable fragment of Christian antiquity which assumes the title of an Epistle of Barnabas. And the worthy ecclesiastic proves, from Jeremiah Jones's own shewing, that no less than eighteen writers give their verdict against him. Perhaps it might not occur to the reverend writer that one sound argument is better than twenty authorities. But after all, why does the reverend prebendary give himself all this trouble of copying from and refuting Mr. Jones? We have already said, "we give him this Barnabas," in return for the bishop's great liberality in *giving Origen* to Dr. Priestley.

But enough, and more than enough, of comments upon these miserable cavils. They shew, however, the spirit with which theological discussion is conducted by the reverend prebendary and by men like him. He *trusts* forsooth that all these illiberal sarcasms and gross misrepresentations "*are not unworthy of a gentleman or a Christian*;" but at any rate, they are utterly unworthy of a calm, a serious, and impartial inquirer after truth.

Of this distinction indeed the reverend prebendary is not ambitious. How is it possible that he should? Tied down, in an enlightened and inquisitive era, to a system of theology, the wretched relick of a dark and barbarous age, upon the profession and defence of which all his hopes are built, TRUTH must necessarily be the object of his terror and abhorrence: And next to the mighty effort of closing his own eyes against her beautiful ray, must be his eagerness to obstruct her progress, by raising a cloud of sophisms to bewilder the minds of others, and by attempting to bear down the advocates of truth by insolence and dogmatism. The father tried the experiment, but it did not answer his purpose: nor will it succeed better in the hands of the son. Truth is omnipotent and will maintain her course. When one instrument is laid aside another will supply its place. All will accomplish the purpose for which they were designed. Even the efforts of the adversaries of truth to oppose her progress shall eventually contribute to accelerate her march.

Aware of the difficult situation of the established clergy, the present writer, who in the pursuit of truth neither desires nor envies the honours and emoluments of an establishment, has endeavoured as far as possible to avoid coming into contact with it: and where he has had occasion to mention the established religion of his country, he has treated it with all the respect which was consistent with a paramount regard to truth; and if he has differed from any of her eminent theological writers, he is not conscious that he has upon such occasions departed from the forms of civilized society. In the intercourses of life it has been his fortune to be occasionally connected with and even nearly related to some persons of no mean station in the church. And it has been his happiness to be acquainted with many whose morals have been an ornament to their profession. Nor do his sentiments, either concerning the expedience of an established religion, or the advantage of an episcopal hierarchy, or the propriety of public liturgies, differ so far from those of the best writers of the established church, as those of many of his nonconformist brethren. But upon the subject of Christian doctrine, and especially the fundamental truth of the Unity of God and the object of worship, he feels it his duty to be firm. He can make no compromise with antichristian error. But while he bears his public testimony to what he conceives, after long and patient inquiry, to be the pure doctrine of Christ, he is solicitous to abstain from all illiberal reflections upon the talents, learning and character of those who conscientiously hold opinions which were once his own.

With these views he has cautiously refrained from entering into controversy with the established clergy, and has remained silent under an enormous mass of obloquy, of misrepresentation and contemptuous abuse. Nor would he have deviated from his general rule upon the present occasion had he not flattered himself that by the attention which this controversy may excite, the complete, indisputable victory of his honoured and departed friend over his learned and able antagonist might become more generally known; and that from henceforth no unhallowed arm might presume to tear from the brow of Dr. Priestley his well-earned laurels.

The reverend gentleman concludes his animadversions with expressing an assurance that if the public receive his work with candour, "the sentiments of Mr. Belsham will give him no concern." No doubt he speaks the truth. And with equal sincerity Mr. B. can return the compliment that if *his* works are approved by the lovers of truth, and the serious enquirers after it—the sentiments of the whole body of preferment-hunters will give him no molestation whatever.

The Appendix closes with a Greek sentence, perhaps intended for the Prince's eye; who, though he may be no theologian, is said to be an elegant scholar, and though he may be very indifferent to the fate of the church at Ælia, may feel interested in the fortunes of a clergyman whom he has graciously permitted to dedicate to him a defence of that crazy edifice. In these lines the reverend prebendary expresses his earnest wish, a wish in which the writer of this letter, and no doubt *many others*, heartily concur, that *he was completely out of debt*. Οφειλοιμι μηδενι μηδεν, κ.τ.λ. And if the Prince Regent should take the hint, and graciously relieve the reverend prebendary from all his difficulties by rewarding his exertions with a golden prebend, or a richer deanery, it would occasion no surprise if, in that event, the worthy ecclesiastic should, like his father before him, leave the orthodox Hebrew church at Ælia, together with our *holy brethren the primitive saints of Jerusalem,* who so nobly bartered the rights of their ancestors for the privileges of the Roman colony, to shift for themselves, till some other champion, from motives either of generosity or prudence, shall again undertake the cause.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
T. BELSHAM.

Sketch of English Protestant Persecution.—Letter VIII.

Sir, *Oct.* 18, 1813.

My last letter was concluded (p. 313) with Hollingshead's description of Queen Elizabeth as "a governor that promoted liberty of conscience." I then expected much sooner to have inquired into the exactness of the old historian's character of the queen.

This phrase *liberty of conscience,* has had, at different times, various significations, not unlike the *liberty of the press,* which at some periods comprehended a right to censure, and at others was limited strictly to the expression of panegyric. Thus liberty of conscience too often designed only the liberty to worship according to the conscience, real or pretended, of the prince or power in possession. That such was the case in the reign of Elizabeth we know on the authority of her secretary Walsingham, in his letter to Monsieur Crotoy, a Frenchman. He indeed describes it as a principle of the queen's government that "consciences are not to be forced, but to be won and reduced, by the force of truth, with the aid of time, and use of all good means of instruction," and represents "her majesty" as "utterly disliking the tyranny of Rome, which had used by terror and rigour to settle commandments of men's faith and consciences." Yet he applauds the queen, because "as a princess of great wisdom and magnanimity she suffered but the exercise of one religion."

I quote these passages from Walsingham's letter, given at length by Burnet (ii. 388) as translated from the French. The bishop did not perceive or perhaps declined to expose the absurdity into which this "great and wise secretary" had fallen, by praising the queen's tenderness for the consciences of her subjects, which ended in permitting but *the exercise of one religion.*

Burnet was a free and manly historian of his own times, yet too often appeared as a *partizan* in his "History of the Reformation of the Church of England." Almost, if not altogether, silent respecting the severities by which that reformation was established under Elizabeth, he describes "the queen" as "of her own nature merciful," because Bonner was permitted to live, and the rest of the deprived bishops were only spoiled of their revenues, debarred the free exercise of their religion, "put in prison for a little while," and then subjected for the remainder of their lives to a more easy restraint. Such was "the queen's gentleness," as Burnet expresses it (ii. 367). He adds, "all this might have been expected from such a queen, and such bishops" as "the reformed divines," who "had learned in the gospel not *to render evil for evil.*"

Yet in this age of inquiry into those facts which historians have either blazoned or disguised, as suited the purpose or party for which they wrote, the character of even *such a queen* has been freely discussed. Nor are there wanting many who agree with a modern female historian, respecting Elizabeth, that "her good fortune is in nothing more conspicuous than in the unmerited fame it has to this day preserved to her," (Macaulay, i. 2). As to the subject in question, it will no longer be denied that many suffered under the government of Elizabeth, as the victims of religious intolerance. The degree and extent of such sufferings are still disputed, nor probably can their amount be now determined with any exactness.

Among those who were united by pains and penalties, inflicted under the joint authority of law and prerogative, there were great disagreements. The Papist revolted at the first step of that Reformation which the Puritan considered, as to rites and ceremonies, as resting far short of gospel simplicity. Yet both would have cordially assisted the Established Church to exterminate that small number of Christians who had discovered, or at least suspected, that the Creeds of both Papists and Protestants contained gross corruptions of *the faith once delivered to the saints.*

I proceed to the case of the Papists now persecuted for the profession of their religion. The history of this religious persecution, undoubtedly severe, is so blended with well-supported accusations of crimes against the state, committed by individuals of the Romish communion, that it is not easy to make the separation. Papal historians have too often ranked among martyrs to their religion those who suffered for attempts against the civil government, which, however excited by religious zeal, made them justly liable to the penal consequences of political delinquency. Protestant writers, on the other hand, with an obvious design, have enlarged on the papal persecution under Mary, while they have left their readers almost ignorant of any thing like a persecution of Papists by her Protestant successor. So just is the remark of Camden, that "persons whose minds differ in religion, do too much obscure the light of honesty and truth on both sides."

According to that annalist, An. 1559, (where he professes to follow Roman Catholic writers) the clergy, at the accession of Elizabeth, including the various dignitaries, were about 9400. Of these all, except 189, conformed to the new religion established by the queen and parliament. There must still have been great numbers among the people attached to the Romish ritual. Yet of these, according to Rapin, there were not wanting those who witnessed the accession of Elizabeth with good-will, though they expected the *reformed* church to be immediately re-established. The historian having remarked that among the

Catholics, some regarded the decease of Mary and the accession of Elizabeth as a death-blow to their religion, adds that others did not regret to see an end of those barbarous punishments by which it had been dishonoured, *n'étoient pas fáchez de voir cesser ces supplices barbares qui la deshonoroient.*

It appears that during the twelve first years of Elizabeth's reign the Catholics enjoyed the private exercise of their religion, by connivance, while on the part of the queen there was an evident desire to assimilate the Church of England, in doctrine and ceremonial, as nearly as possible to the Church of Rome. During this period too his holiness the Pope held with Elizabeth a correspondence conciliating and even complimentary. It appears however, from Camden, An. 1568, that the patience of Pius Quintus being now exhausted, he employed a Florentine who had lived long as a factor in London, to excite the Papists in England secretly against the queen. Two years after having, as Fuller says, (C. H. 92) "long patiently expected the amendment of Elizabeth, and weary with waiting in vain," the pope "resolved at last (if not wisely, valiantly) that seeing desperate diseases must have desperate cures, he would thunder his excommunication against her." In this bull he absolved her subjects from their allegiance, and even commanded them to disobey her, under the penalty of being excommunicated themselves. Yet Dr. Milner, of Winchester, in his Letters to a Prebendary (4 Ed. 212 N.) would have it believed "that Pius V. did not require the English Catholics to receive or observe his bull," because "in fact he never published it, or signified it to them." It will be more to my purpose to observe what sentiments and conduct Camden attributes to the Catholics on this occasion, and how far he agrees on that point with their just-mentioned acute and zealous advocate.

The learned Annalist of *Elizabeth* had recorded, An. 1569, during "the rebellion in the North," that the insurgents "sent letters to the Papists round about throughout the whole kingdom, exhorting them to join their forces with their's. But so far were they from associating themselves with them, that most of them sent the letters which they received, together with the bearers, to the Queen, and every one strived who should be forwardest, from all parts of the land, to offer his person and his purse against them." Having mentioned the daring act of *John Felton*, who hung the Pope's *bull* on the Bishop of London's palace gates. An. 1570, Camden adds, "The most part of the moderate sort of Papists secretly misliked this *bull*, because there had no admonition preceded according to law, and foreseeing also that hereby a great heap of mischief hung over their heads, who before had private exercise of their religion within their own houses quietly enough, or else refused not to go to the service of God received in the English church, without scruple of conscience. And from that time many of them continued firm in their obedience."

Camden thus appears to countenance the general representation of this subject made by Dr. Milner in his Letters. That zealous partizan of the Catholics goes indeed the length of asserting, respecting this *bull,* (p. 212) that "only one person in their whole number, John Felton, is known to have approved of it." This is marvellous considering the deference to the personal authority of the Pope then entertained, at least, among the vulgar. It is to be regretted that such a fair enquirer as Dr. Geddes had not examined this question in his Modest Apology.

The influence of this ill-advised measure on the condition of the Catholics, through the remainder of Elizabeth's reign, with a short view of the sufferings endured by Puritans and Unitarians, during the same period must be reserved to another letter.

R. G. S.

Difficulties in the Doctrine of a Resurrection.

Maidstone, Oct. 8, 1813.

Sir,

It is necessarily by a slow process that the human mind advances in the discovery of the one infinite Cause of the universe. Of this truth I cannot but think, that the extreme difficulty which is still felt by the student in Christian theology, concerning the possibility of a resurrection, by the sole energy of the Deity, affords a somewhat striking attestation. "If I die wholly," says your correspondent Cantabrigiensis, "a resurrection appears scarcely within the bounds of possibility.*"

Now if there be, properly speaking, one, and but one, absolute eternal Cause; if the creature be the simple entire result of the infinite power and intelligence of the Creator; if every being which begins to exist, exists but as the pure effect of a particular mode of operation of the infinite Cause, as the stream proceeds wholly from its fountain; then surely it must be equally possible to restore any particular being, or modification of being, after it has been absolutely withdrawn, or suspended for any period, as it was absolutely to produce it in the first instance, and to continue its existence uniformly for any term. An absolutely dependant being, owes its preservation to the constant continuance of that particular operating energy by which it was produced; if its mode of operation be changed, the creature, which is the pure result of that operation, must sustain a correspondent change; if the operating cause be wholly suspended, the creature, which is the effect, must wholly cease; and if it be renewed in precisely the same manner, precisely the same created effect must result from the operation; and no reason appears why the same exact operation cannot be renewed, as well as originally excited, continued and suspended, by the infinite Operator.

This general reasoning is remarkably confirmed by the actual history of the human mind in this state. If by the immortality of the soul be meant the continued, uninterrupted existence of the mind, or of the operations of thought and its affections, in which sense alone any distinct ideas can be annexed to the phrase, nothing can be more contrary to our constant experience. The mind, or faculty of perception, is uniformly suspended, either totally, or so far at least as it respects any practical purposes, during the night season. In profound sleep, all perception, or consciousness, which is but a reflex act of perception, ceases; mind hath no real existence. Yet so far is this suspension of the mental process from destroying its identity, or operating as any real obstacle to its existence, or successful operations, that there is reason to believe it is essential to these purposes. The same mind is restored, with the return of morning, in a state of renewed vigor and fitness for future action. Should, however, any doubts be entertained respecting the reality of this suspension in sleep, which is nevertheless a matter of plain experience, as far as a negation can be said to be so, they will surely not be extended to the state of dormancy, to which the human species have in some instances been subjected, and from which they have sometimes recovered the full possession of their minds and of their conscious identity, as in the case of the ordinary returns of vigilance. In this state it is often impossible by any natural means to impart sensation, which is the first principle of perception, to the patient; and it can scarcely be distinguished from death, in which it frequently terminates, by any other circumstance than the absence of putrefaction. . . . Now if in the usual course of nature the mind can be thus withdrawn and restored, not only without impediment, but with real advantage to its existence and conscious sameness; if the functions of the system can be absolutely suspended for a season, and afterwards recalled to the production of precisely the same mental effect as before, why may not the like be effected, with correspondent advantages, by the more immediate intervention of the Deity? Why may he not for any term, which his infinite wisdom may dictate, suspend the *existence*, as well as the *operations* of that curious mechanism by which mind is produced, and again re-organize it, with such alterations in its structure and external circumstances as may be more immediately adapted to the future purposes of its existence? The organ though renewed will, if adapted to the production of the same mental effects as before, be essentially the same, and a renewed vigor and enlargement of capacity may surely be imparted to it, not only without endangering, but with the greatest advantages to its former and future attainments. "The power of uniting the past and future with the present" will be promoted both by the improved powers of the organ, and by its advantageous circumstance, on its entrance on the world now future; while the scenes with which we are now immediately conversant, being contemplated with a strong but distant and comprehensive view, will be seen more according to the true character and just relation to the general scheme of things. The same mind being thus restored, with vast advantages, with regard both to its former and future acquisitions, will obtain a more complete self-possession than it had ever before experienced, and may feel a peculiar degree of self-complacency, both in its conscious identity and the glorious changes which it has undergone.

---

* Vol. VIII. p. 448, 449.

With regard to the supposition of Cantabrigiensis, that upon the principle of an absolute restoration of being or as he denominates it, " a new creation, any number of beings might be himself" it is not only inconsistent with the idea of renovation, which can apply only to the same number, as well as to the same beings in every other respect, as those which had previously existed; but it involves the contradiction of supposing that many can be one; and he might with equal propriety suppose, that any number of beings in the present state might be constituted exactly alike; and that their minds and conscious identities might be so similar, or so blended together, that neither themselves nor others could distinguish between them, except from their numerical difference and that of their external circumstances; and might urge it as an argument against the present existence, that any number of persons being created precisely like himself, might actually be himself! But the fact is, that as we are all necessarily numerically different, and different with regard to our external circumstances, so are these circumstances uniformly and necessarily accompanied with correspondent differences, in the structure of our minds and their respective acquisitions. These differences, which commence in some degree from our birth, and are promoted by the several peculiarities which attend the experience and mental operation of each individual; and if a difference is discernable between us on our *first* entrance into being, there is reason to believe a much more marked difference will attend our *second* entrance, with all our respective former acquisitions, accompanied with a renovated vigor adapted to review them with peculiar advantages. . . Unity of person is a circumstance essentially connected with conscious identity. The mind is an image or representation of external things; and if the person to which it belongs, together with surrounding objects, preserve their sameness, with only such alterations, as might reasonably be expected, the mind, which is the transcript will likewise preserve its sameness and its reflex consciousness of it. But if so material an alteration is introduced as that of the multiplication of persons exactly similar, the utmost disorder must be introduced into its conceptions, and conscious diversity and confusion must take place of conscious uniformity and sameness.

Much of the difficulty that has been felt upon this subject, seems to have arisen from the idea that matter, and perhaps mind also, have a kind of independent existence, and consequently that certain particular portions of one or both are necessary to constitute the same being. But in fact the supposition of more than one infinite independent Being is a manifest absurdity; all existence either is the Deity himself, or the result of his operations. And that our future existence should depend rather on such an extraordinary act of his power, as is usually considered as the effect of his more immediate intervention, than on any of those ordinary operations to which the name of secondary causes is usually applied, may have a peculiar tendency to promote in our minds a just sense of our absolute dependance; as well as be productive of peculiar advantages, with regard to the future constitution of our frame.

The analogy on which I have insisted between sleep and death, resurrection and returning vigilance, is frequently alluded to in the scriptures; and the phrase *sleeping with their fathers*, is a common expression to denote the state of dissolution. When Christ *awakened Lazarus out of sleep*, after he had been dead four days, and his body had become putrid, there can be no doubt that his former mind was restored, with the renewed vigor of his corporeal system, after a manner perfectly analagous to what is experienced on the ordinary returns of vigilance, or in recovery from a state of dormancy. It must however have been effected by what is denominated the immediate interposition of the Deity, that interposition which first *formed man out of the dust of the ground*, which *fed five thousand men, besides women and children, from five loaves and a few small fishes*, which rendered the widow's cruse of oil, an exhaustless source of sustenance, and which could surely have produced the same effects, although no dust, no fishes, and no oil had been present for their production.

Notwithstanding the objections of Cantabrigiensis to the resurrection of Christ, as being "scarcely the case in point, that Unitarian divines represent it," I cannot but think that it is admirably adapted to testify and illustrate the great doctrine of a resurrection from mortality to a state of immortality. Had not the body of Jesus, before it was dissolved, been removed from its place of sepulchre, and exhibited alive precisely in the same state in which he was formerly known, the evidence to his disciples, and men in general, of the reality of his resurrection would not have been equally satisfactory. The existence of the dead body, or its remains, would have been regarded as a proof that he was not really risen. But although the same body was in this case occasionally exhibited, by the most indubitable proofs, yet proofs no less indubitable were presented, that its usual, and what may therefore be denominated its natural state, was not that of an *animal* or *earthly*, but of a *spiritual*, invisible and *heavenly* body. His usual state, subsequent to his resurrection, was that of invisibility, though, often at least, if not uniformly, previous to his ascension, of intimate mental presence. The same mind now inhabited a body of much more subtle composition, or rather both had undergone a glorious transformation, while yet the essential characteristics of identity were preserved; and having borne this image which appertained to their earthly estate, they now assumed that which belonged to their heavenly destination. His mode of *manifesting himself* to his disciples, from a state of invisibility, in his own original form, and with precisely his former habitudes, and his again *vanishing out of their sight*, afforded probably the most satisfactory evidence that could be given of a transformation from mortality to immortality, while yet the essentials of the same being were effectually preserved. The apostles could entertain no doubts, after these repeated exhibitions, of his person eating, drinking, conversing, and even being handled and examined by them, and after repeatedly witnessing his transformations from and to a state of invisibility, terminating in his visible ascent into heaven, either of the reality of his resurrection in his own proper person, or of the glorious change which he had undergone. It would operate on their minds as a complete pledge and pattern of their own resurrection and glorious transformation. Nor was it necessary to this object that any part of the old body should be retained. The power who could thus preserve the same person under such different forms, rendering him alternately what, in modern language, may be denominated matter and spirit, or visibly existent, and again apparently unexistent, though mentally present, could surely have produced precisely the same effect, although the old body had been suffered to moulder in its sepulchre. It was most manifest in this case, that both body and spirit are but the pure effects of the creative, and transforming efficacy of God—And we have substantial grounds for relying on the assurance of Christ, that *all that are in their graves*, or who have passed through this vale of mortality, *shall hear his voice and come forth*, each appearing in his own proper person and character, and *receive the reward of the deeds done in this life*; they whose conduct has been generally upright and virtuous, and who have thus attained to a meetness for heavenly enjoyment, entering immediately on the fruition of immortality; while those whose conduct has marked the prevalent influence of this world in their minds, will, even on their entrance on this renovated being, find the *sentence of sin and of death still reigning in their members.*

T. B.

Vindication of the Dialogue on the Scriptures in Reply to Mr. Sturch.

[Continued from p. 653.]

In the course of his animadversions, Mr. S. objects to the strength of my expressions, such as "eternal misery," and so forth. If Mr. S. had been half as familiar with the scriptures, as I give him credit for being with the pages of philosophy, he would, perhaps, not have raised this objection. Bearing in mind such passages as the following—"These shall go away into everlasting punishment:"*—"Into hell, into the fire that shall never be quenched, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched:"†—having in his recollection, I say, these, and similar passages, Mr. S. would at least have allowed, that I had not gone further than the gospel authorised me to go. He will not, I am aware, receive the sacred records as an authority from which there is no appeal; this his general language makes very evident; but I have yet to learn what *degree* of importance he is disposed to attach to them.

One of three things he must allow; either that they are altogether of divine origin; that they are partially so; or that they are merely a human composition. The first supposition is obviously not that of Mr. S., and if he have adopted the second, I have only to beg of him, that he will tell me what parts I may venture to believe, and what to reject, of a book, the whole of which (I am speaking more particularly of the New Testament) rests upon the same evidence. I imagine, however, that Mr. S. never thinks of the scriptures in any other light than as a book of mere human origin. Now if this be the case, I affirm that Mr. S. cannot honestly (though he says that he would do so) recommend them to any living being. For if that book which says, "all scriptures were written by inspiration of God," be not written by inspiration of God, then is it false? And carrying in the face of it one falsehood so egregious as that which I have just supposed, what credit can we possibly give to stories so improbable as the feeding of 5000 human beings with five loaves and two fishes; the raising of a dead man; the conversion of water into wine, and so on? Now though we might as good fathers take a world of pains to prevent our children from regarding these narrations in any other light than that of amusing fables, yet such silly prejudices have the bulk of people about us, that it will be next to impossible for our young ones not to hear the scriptures spoken of by the majority of those they mix with, as uniformly and minutely true. It is evident, therefore, how great danger they run of adopting a belief which must pervert their imaginations, and miserably impede them in their search after truth. As a book of amusement Mr. S. would do much better to put the Arabian Nights into his children's hands, and for their moral instruction I would recommend to him in preference to "the collection called the Scriptures," the collection called Miss Edgeworth's Moral Tales, because this latter being received as a book confessedly of mere invention, "*if it did no good, could do no harm.*" I thank Mr. S. for making me aware how improperly I used those words before; I now perceive that in his estimation the scriptures must be capable of doing the *greatest* harm. So great being the probable danger of reading them, and so certain the possibility of obtaining all that is good in them through other channels, (for the same morality is now transfused into very many other books), I hope, for the credit of his understanding, consistency, and independence of character, that Mr. S. had for a moment forgotten himself, when he talked of recommending "the collection called the scriptures."

---

* Matt. xxv. 46.

† Mark ix. 43, 44.

In the next place, Sir, I have to defend my assertion that a religious motive alone can sanctify any, our best actions. Either the scriptures do or they do not insist on a certain definite mode of conduct; and they do or do not prescribe to that conduct a certain definite motive. That they do so, is evident from the following texts. Paul says, [1 Cor. x. 31] "Whether therefore ye eat or drink," (as if he had said in the most unimportant things) "or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." And again, he says, [Coloss. iii. 17] "And whatsoever ye do in word, or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him."* The motive then, if the scriptures may be depended on, is full as necessary as the act, or rather it is for the motive's sake alone that the act can be accepted by God. *A priori*, all our actions must be equally indifferent to him, for they are all equally unable to affect either his happiness, greatness, glory, or power. To believe this is necessary to our notions of an all-perfect being. None of our actions therefore can be acceptable to God for their own sake; none of them can be acceptable to him, but as they are done, *because* he *wills* to have them done, and *as* he *wills* to have them done. Now we have no, even *pretended*, declaration of God's will but that which appears in the scriptures, unless it be that which it is affirmed may be gathered from the suggestions of reason or conscience, and I have shewn how entirely unable these are to enlighten us on this momentous subject. On the whole then, we can have no reasonable expectations that our actions shall be accepted by God, but as they agree with the injunctions of the scriptures, and the scriptures as, I have shewn, insist on the motive no less than the act.

I must beg leave to intrude on your patience yet a little longer. Mr. S. says that I have misrepresented facts as it relates to the opinion of the ancients with respect to revenge. If what I said on this subject implied that there never were amongst the ancients any individuals who thought revenge wrong, I willingly confess that I spoke too much at large. Mr. S. has made evident by his quotations, (what was readily allowed before) that in the long course of time a few such men, at least, have existed, men who thought that we ought not to be "*greatly* offended even with our enemies," and that "placability," and "clemency," were graceful. But so small has been their number, that they should rather be adduced as exceptions to prove this general rule, viz. that reason and conscience do not point out or discover revenge to be a crime, than for any other purpose.* I would no more say, that the ancients accounted revenge a crime, because a few individuals amongst them did so, than I would affirm that professing Christians make the Scriptures a lie, or a dead letter, or a mass of contradiction and absurdity, because a few individuals amongst them do so.

To conclude, Sir, I think it is pretty obvious, on the whole, that Mr. S. would willingly enough substitute books of philosophy for the col-tion called the Scriptures, for he seems to think it a matter of great indifference, whether people even read the latter or not; he is even somewhat angry with me for recommending them so very earnestly to my friend's perusal, whilst he himself advocates the cause of the Heathens with little less zeal. Now, if for a moment we allow Mr. S. to be one of those favoured mortals, whose superior penetration might have discovered these important truths in religion and morality, which revelation has made known to us, (and which, by the way, initiated as he has been into them from his infancy, he can never know that he should have discovered) yet what would the bulk of men, less intellectual or less inquiring, have done? If none but philosophers might discover, or receive these truths so necessary to be known, alas! how little may we hope that that immense body of men, who form at present the unchristianized part of the world, shall ever, continuing such, know the truth as it is in Jesus. How little may we hope, that peace and good-will shall ever be universally established amongst men; that those blessed times foretold in the gospel shall ever arrive, when every man shall be safe under his own vine and under his own fig-tree! Christians, all men, the most unlettered, the most ignorant, may be; but when shall we see a world of philosophers? What inconceivable combination of circumstances shall produce this unheard of effect? And supposing even that all men should, at some future period, acquire, by dint of philosophy, a perfect knowledge of moral and religious good and evil, what, short of the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, could ensure the observance of one, and forbearance from the other? What engine powerful enough to effect these great ends, in any degree worth our consideration, when even scripture threats and promises are unable wholly to effect them?

---

* I trust, Sir, that these two quotations settle the question as effectually, as if I had adduced all the texts to the same purpose, which it is possible to bring forward.

* I think it would be easy, but certainly not worth the trouble, to shew that there is an essential difference between Christian forgiveness and heathen *placability*, which is a sort of qualified, conditional forgiveness, presupposing something conceded on the part of the offender. Surely, *placabilitas*, *misericordia*, and *clementia*, have meanings very different from that which we attach to the forgiveness inculcated by the gospel; *μη μνησικάκος* comes nearest to the spirit of it, perhaps, but is far from fully expressing it. To have had a full apprehension of this most amiable Christian quality, the ancients must have first felt Christian humility.

I am, Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
A. L. B.

OBITUARY.

Mrs. A. Smith.

Died, suddenly, on the 2nd of September last, in the 63rd year of her age, at Ringmer, near Lewes, in Sussex, (where she had been for a short time on a visit) **Mrs. Ann Smith**, relict of the late Mr. Richard Smith, for many years a resident of Brighton, in the same county.

Educated in conformity to the established church, she continued in union with that body till she was about nineteen, when, on hearing some of the discourses of the late Rev. Mr. De Courcey, she became a dissenter from *principle*. The religion of Protestant Dissenters in those days, and especially in that part of the country (Sussex) was by no means a fashionable thing; to follow the path of duty was then a matter of serious and weighty importance, and those who did so, had daily to "take up their cross," to subdue the passions, and to sacrifice some of the most endearing ties of nature at the shrine of truth. This she found by experience; for in thus publicly declaring her change of sentiment, she had to combat the ridicule and contempt of her acquaintance, as well as the prejudices, the promises, and the bitter threats of her nearest relatives. But she had made her election, and her resolution was not to be shaken; she freely gave up all, being assured "that whoso forsaketh not father or mother, for the great cause of Christ is unworthy of him." In order to shew the serious nature of her undertaking, it may be observed, that to worship God agreeably to the dictates of her conscience, was not only generally at the risk of personal assault, but more than once at the imminent hazard of her life.

In, or about the year 1780, she, together with her husband, was baptized at Battle, and joined the Calvinist Baptist church in that place, under the then pastoral care of Mr. W. Vidler, (now of Parliament Court, London.) In this communion she lived for some years, in sentiment a Calvinist, and nothing particular arising to agitate the question of orthodoxy, a quiet acquiescence in the received dogmas of Calvinism precluded the deadly crime of heresy.

This calm was not always to continue. A circumstance in the course of Divine Providence occurred, which, while it roused in her breast, all the tender feelings of a fond mother, shewed her the fallacy of her religious sentiments, as a refuge in the hour of distress. This was the loss of a beloved and only daughter, snatched off in her childhood. Her affliction was deep: and while her habitual piety induced submission, it also naturally solicited her attention to the Divine character for support under this severe stroke of his hand. But here, instead of consolation, she found herself plunged in tenfold doubt and misery. She dared not look to heaven, lest her child should be missing from that seat of bliss. The grave was dark: futurity was dreadful. "Who," she would exclaim, "can assure me, in the small number of the elect, my child is included? Ah, me! miserable! can I bear the thought? There is a doubt! nay, a high probability she is not!—What! is this dear infant, for whom I have suffered all a mother's pains, for whose existence my willing knees have often bowed in grateful homage to the Father of Spirits, whose sick couch I have nightly watched, and from the overflowings of an aching heart bedewed with unavailing tears,—and whose untimely death I now so deeply mourn,—is she formed for no other purpose than endless damnation? Yes, yes, it may be so; my creed declares it, and, oh, dreadful thought! I must hear and approve the sentence of the Judge! must laugh at her tribulation and anguish! the mother must exult in the unending torments of her child!"

Such reflections, (the natural conflict between her better feelings and the horrid doctrines of Calvinism) reduced her mind to a situation little short of distraction, and insanity or infidelity must have been the consequence, had not some friendly voice whispered in her ear,—"The all-bountiful God will some way find a means to exempt those from punishment who have not actually sinned."

Although she had no clear conception, according to her preconceived ideas, how the Deity could be so bountiful, yet the sentiment afforded a buoyance to her mind; and in this state of doubt and hope (the family having removed to Brighton) she joined the Calvinist Baptist church there in 1790, under the then pastoral charge of Mr. Thomas Vine, (the present respected member and supporter of the Unitarian cause in that place.) It may be worthy of remark, that her husband was still *soundly orthodox;* so that she stood quite unsupported, till about the year 1792 or 3, the poison of heresy began to insinuate itself into this orthodox church; the symptoms were of no doubtful nature, and the disease spreading with rapidity, amputation was deemed absolutely necessary, and, shocking to relate, the pastor's name stands the first of eighteen who were dismembered incurable and whom no threats or intreaties could prevail on to sign this favourite article in their creed, "That Christ died for the elect, *and the elect only.*"

Among this number is to be found the name of the subject of this memoir. The doctrine of God's universal love was congenial to her mild and benevolent temper; her heart had long been in a state of preparation to receive it; and hope, and joy, and peace were the happy consequences.

The opposition of the orthodox party, as before observed, was very violent; their arguments indeed few, but conclusive; their zeal making ample amends for such trifling deficiencies; all with one voice declaring "the doctrine, (viz. universal restoration) to be a damnable error, sprung from hell," and one, to give the finishing stroke and set the question for ever at rest, asserted, "That if it should please God to send him to hell, he *would not come out again.*"

It may not be a matter incurious to the reader to learn, that this circumstance, was the first cause of the subsequent introduction of the glorious doctrine of Unitarianism in Brighton. The deceased was one of the first who had the honour of professing and supporting in that place the more extended views of God's love to his creatures,—though it must at the same time be acknowledged, she never carried her sentiments farther on this subject than as taught by the late Mr. Winchester;—this may be accounted for,

1st. By the relief which her mind had so long and anxiously sought, being afforded in the doctrine of universal restoration.

2dly. This doctrine was founded on her already pre-conceived notions of divine vengeance and Christ as a vicarious sacrifice, &c. &c. and

3dly. Connected with this, her being then arrived at that time of life, when the mind seldom disengages itself from every early opinion. In the universal doctrine therefore from that period she both lived and rejoiced, and maintained it to her death.

To a temper of uncommon natural sweetness and benevolence, she united undeviating firmness of character in avowing and following the convictions of her mind;—exhibiting through the whole course of her life, an example of integrity, of Christian meekness, and unaffected piety.—Generous and faithful in her friendships—she was also mild and placable to her enemies; conducting herself through all the relations of life with such respect and attention to its duties,—that those who best knew her, esteemed and honoured her the most.

The writer who offers this imperfect tribute to the departed worth of the tenderest, the most affectionate of mothers, cannot conclude without expressing a hope, that her example may have its due effect; and her memory, and her virtues may be so cherished by those who survive, that it may be said of a truth, "being dead she yet speaketh."

W. T.

Rev. John Mills.

Died the Rev. JOHN MILLS, late Pastor of the General Baptist Church, meeting in St. Thomas's Street, Portsmouth. The deceased was a native of an obscure village in Northamptonshire, but from his eighth till his twentieth year appears to have resided with his father, who was many years pastor of the General Baptist Church at March, in Cambridgeshire, when he went to London, and acted as an assistant in a school of respectability, conducted by the Rev. Mr. Noble, predecessor of the Rev. J. Evans, qualifying himself at the same time for the ministry, till he accepted an invitation from the Church of Portsmouth to become their pastor, to which office he was ordained on the 30th July, 1771; his father, the Rev. Thomas Mills, the Revs.—Evershed, Sparshott, and J. Sturch officiating on the occasion. This situation he filled till the month of April, 1812, a period of upwards of forty years, when from the debility of age, and an increasing weight of infirmities he felt obliged to resign. The latter years of his life were much afflicted, but as might have been expected, they served only to perfect his patience, and display his resignation. His decease happened on the 9th Sept. last, being then in his 75th year, and his remains were interred a few days afterwards in the General Baptist Meeting-house, on which occasion an appropriate address was delivered by the Rev. Jos. Brent, of Godalmin; who further improved the event of his death, in an impressive discourse, to a respectable and numerous audience on the Sunday evening following, from the words of Paul to Titus, Chap. iv. verses 7 and 8.

As a man Mr. M. was exemplary in the discharge of every duty; affectionate as a husband, kind and benevolent as a relative, steady and firm as a friend; he was attached to the cause of liberty, civil and religious, an advocate for learning, and a promoter of free inquiry.—As a minister he did not stand high in the scale of popularity, though much close reasoning and sound argument were to be found in his discourses, which were ever addressed to the understanding of his hearers, and though sensible of the importance of just views of religion, his aim was generally to improve the morals and correct the heart. As a Baptist he was ever strenuous for that ordinance being administered by immersion, as he was thoroughly satisfied that such was the mode adopted by Jesus, followed by his apostles, and left for his example. As a

General Baptist he entertained enlarged views of the benignity of the Divine Being; and he taught as he believed, that the operations of the divine government would result in the ultimate well-being of all God's rational creation. With respect to the Deity he held the scriptural doctrine of his unity in its strictest sense, and though he ascribed a pre-existent dignity to Jesus Christ, the One God was the sole object of his adoration and worship. That holding such sentiments, he should have experienced much of the contumely attendant on an open avowal of them will not be thought strange; but though he met with his full share of this trial, like his heaven-commissioned Master, when reviled he reviled not again, and if he met with curses his blessing was ever ready in return. Not long before his death, during an interval in which he appeared to possess the full exercise of his faculties, a friend observed to him, that "he hoped they should meet in a better world," he replied, "I believe so;" another said to him, "I hope, Sir, that as through a long life you did not find Christianity to be a cunningly devised fable, you find it a comfort to you in your affliction?" "I do find it," he answered, "a comfort now, and more than that, I shall feel its support in the article of death." It was thus that rational Christianity could soothe the death bed of its votary, and faith forbids a doubt but that there is laid up for him that crown of righteousness, which the Lord the Righteous Judge shall give to all his faithful ministers, and all those who love his appearing.

S. P.

Newport, Isle of Wight.

INTELLIGENCE.

Opening of the Unitarian Chapel, Reading.

It is now about two years since Mr. Vidler first went down from the Unitarian Fund to Reading. His preaching, as is well known to our readers, drew over a respectable number of persons to the Unitarian doctrine, and, of consequence, to Unitarian worship These have not, even under unfavourable circumstances, "forsaken the assembling of themselves together;" they have been accustomed to meet, often without a preacher, in a commodious and spacious workshop. At length, they have obtained a proper place of worship; a small chapel, formerly occupied by a congregation of Calvinists, fell into the hands of one of the members of the Unitarian Society, a builder; and he has enlarged and improved, and, it may be truly said, beautified it, and it was occupied for the first time as a Unitarian Chapel, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the 23d, 24th, and 25th instant. Mr. Vidler had conducted the services in the temporary meeting-house, for the last time, the preceding Sunday.

On Tuesday evening, Mr. Vidler opened the worship in the Chapel by prayer, and Mr. T. Rees preached, from Acts iv. 18, 19, a Sermon on the Principles of Dissent from Established Churches; arguing against the interference of the magistrate in matters of religion, and urging the importance of Unitarians asserting their faith, and observing their worship in assemblies of their own.

The service on the Wednesday morning was introduced by Mr. Rees, with the reading of the scriptures and prayer. Mr. Vidler was to have preached, but was prevented by sudden indisposition; this duty therefore fell to Mr. Aspland, who delivered a discourse from Mark xii. 28—30, on the importance of the doctrine of the Divine Unity.

Between the morning and evening services of this day, the gentlemen of the Society and their friends dined together, Mr. Rutt in the Chair, and the pleasant and edifying conversation that took place, will long be remembered by all present. The company consisted of about fifty persons,

In the evening Mr. Rees again introduced the service, and Mr. Aspland again preached; the text, Gal. vi. 14,—the subject, the death of Christ. The preacher considered, first, the scriptural account of this event, and secondly, the account of it given in the prevailing systems of Christianity; and then compared the two accounts, and concluded with remarks and exhortations, bearing upon the Unitarian faith and the moral duties of Unitarians.

There was a collection at the doors after each service. Nearly twenty pounds were collected.

The last service was on Thursday evening, when Mr. Aspland preached once more by appointment: the subject, Paul before Felix, from Acts xxiv. 24, 25.

The pleasantness of the services was much enhanced by the very agreeable mode in which the congregation conduct their singing; the choir is assisted by several appropriate instruments, played with judgment and taste.

The number in the several congregations varied, but the place was more than once well filled.

Mr. Vidler's indisposition threw a damp upon the minds of the congregation and their friends; but before the services closed they had the satisfaction of witnessing an amendment in his health, and have the pleasing prospect of his ministerial labours (with the blessing of Divine Providence) the two following Sundays; after which they expect (with the same reliance upon the Disposer of our times) to be visited by Messrs. Bennett, Gilchrist, and others.

Nov. 27, 1813.

TRINITY BILL.

Unitarian Fund.

At a Special General Meeting of the Subscribers to the Unitarian Fund, holden at the King's Head Tavern, in the Poultry, on Friday, August 20, 1813,

Mr. Alderman **GOODBEHERE** in the Chair.

Resolved unanimously,

I. That we conceive it to be the right of every man—a right derived immediately from the Almighty Creator—to form his own religious opinions, to profess them amongst his neighbours and fellow-creatures, and to act upon them in the exercises of divine worship;—that in religious opinion, profession, and worship, as held, avowed and observed in Great Britain, there is no interruption of the peace of civil society, and no call for the interference of the magistrate, who cannot affect to Tolerate without assuming authority to Persecute; and that all penal statutes, whether they enact fine or imprisonment, or positive bodily suffering, or whether they declare civil disabilities, exclusion and privation, on the ground solely of such opinion, profession and worship, are manifest invasions of natural right, and equally repugnant to the Christian Religion, and to the spirit of the British Constitution.

Resolved unanimously,

II. That as Unitarian Christians, distinguished from our fellow Christians only by the faith and worship which we have learned from the Holy Scriptures,—that the God and Father of the Universe is one Being, Mind and Person, the sole object of Religious Worship, and that Jesus Christ is the chosen, honoured, and divinely-endowed Messenger of God,—we had long felt the injustice of being excluded by positive statute from even that share of religious liberty which was allowed to the mass of Protestant Dissenters;—for which exclusion we humbly conceive no reason was to be found in our character and conduct as subjects and citizens, wherein we have never yielded, and can never yield, the superiority to any denomination or class of our countrymen.

Resolved unanimously,

III. That we congratulate our Unitarian brethren on the Bill lately passed into a Law for the relief of those who impugn the doctrine of the Trinity: the British Legislature having thus readily performed an act of justice denied by the House of Commons, twenty years ago, to the earnest and eloquent application of that able and enlightened and ever-memorable statesman, the late Mr. Fox.

Resolved,

IV. That in common with all the friends of religious liberty and just government, we rejoice that persecuting laws, enacted at the æra of the Revolution, in direct violation of the principles then asserted, and which, though too cruel and impolitic to be often enforced, have yet remained for a century the disgrace of the statute book, are at length expunged, amidst a general acquiescence in the justice and even necessity of their repeal.

Resolved unanimously,

V. That our best acknowledgments are due to William Smith, Esq. M P. for his compliance with the request, originating in our Committee, to bring the subject of the legal insecurity of Unitarians before Parliament, and for his unremitted attention to the Parliamentary progress of the Bills, which he accordingly brought into the House of Commons, for the repeal of those penal statutes which had so long rendered Unitarians liable to be deprived of *civil* protection merely on the ground of their *religious* profession.

Resolved unanimously,

VI. That we trust the period is advancing, and would willingly hasten its arrival, when not only Christians of every description, but also our countrymen at large, shall be alike free to profess and defend their opinions, and all equally partake the civil rights of Britons.

Resolved unanimously,

VII. That as Unitarian Christians feared not to profess and inculcate what they esteem the doctrines of the Gospel, though liable to the infliction of severe penalties, it is their incumbent duty, now that they are placed within the protection of the law, not to relax their efforts, but rather to extend those exertions which well consist with the peace and order of civil society and the purest principles of Christian charity.

Resolved unanimously,

VIII. That the Thanks of this Meeting be given to the Committee of the Unitarian Fund, for their zealous discharge of the trust committed to them, and for their watchfulness over the interests of the Unitarian body.

Resolved unanimously,

IX. That the above Resolutions be printed, and that a copy be sent to every member of the Society within the reach of the twopenny post.

Resolved unanimously,

X. That the Resolutions now passed be advertised in the MONTHLY REPOSITORY,—a publication which, for the support it gives to the cause of free inquiry and religious liberty, is entitled to the countenance of the Unitarian Body, and particularly of this Society.

Resolved unanimously,

XI. That the above Resolutions be advertised also in the principal periodical publications and the newspapers, at the discretion of the Committee.

SAMUEL GOODBEHERE,
Chairman.

John Christie, Esq. having taken the Chair, it was Resolved unanimously,

That the thanks of the Meeting be given to Mr. Alderman Goodbehere for his conduct in the Chair, and for his general support of the rights and liberties of his fellow-citizens and fellow-countrymen of all denominations.

Unitarian Society.

At a Special General Meeting of the Unitarian Society for promoting Christian Knowledge and the Practice of Virtue, by the Distribution of Books, convened for the purpose of taking into consideration the Act lately passed for the "Relief of Persons who impugn the Doctrine of the Trinity," holden at the Chapel in Essex Street, July 30, 1813.

The Rev. THOMAS BELSHAM, in the Chair.

The following Resolutions moved by Isaac Solly, Esq. and seconded by Sir Charles Colville, were adopted :

Resolved,

I. That the Members of this Society view with great satisfaction the recent success of a measure, which more than twenty years ago they solicited in vain, though supported by the transcendent abilities of the late Mr. Fox; and they congratulate each other and the friends of civil and religious liberty in general, that by the Bill which has lately passed for the "relief of those who impugn the doctrine of the Trinity," persons who profess their dissent from that article of the Established Creed are no longer exposed to severe and ruinous penalties, but are placed under the protection of the law.

II. That the Members of this Society are truly grateful to the Legislature for the liberality and unanimity with which this important measure was received; and for the readiness and alacrity with which, when the original Bill was lost, through a technical informality, a new and amended Bill was allowed to be introduced; was expedited through the necessary forms, and was passed by both Houses in time to receive the Royal Assent previously to the prorogation of Parliament.

III. That this Society hail the present measure as an auspicious prelude to that happy day, when all penal laws and political restrictions on religious grounds shall be for ever abolished; when an invidious and limited Toleration shall give way to UNIVERSAL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY; and when all, without distinction, shall be entitled by law to the possession of those civil and political privileges which are the birthright of Britons.

IV. That the thanks of this Society be given to that able and enlightened Member of Parliament, William Smith, Esq. for the generous zeal with which he has stood forward, upon this and many other occasions, to vindicate the rights and liberties of his fellow-subjects; for the promptitude and cheerfulness with which he undertook to introduce this important measure into Parliament; and for the attention and perseverance with which he watched and supported the measure in every stage of its progress, till the Bill, which entitles its author to a conspicuous rank in the honourable records of civil and religious liberty, received the Royal Assent.

V. That the Chairman be desired to communicate these Resolutions of the Society to Mr. Smith.

THOMAS BELSHAM, Chairman.

The Chairman having left the Chair, it was moved by Sir Charles Colville, and seconded by Isaac Solly, Esq.

That the thanks of this Meeting be given to the Rev. T. Belsham for his conduct in the Chair, and for the great zeal which he has on this and every other occasion evinced, both by his exemplary conduct and his masterly writings for the interests of the Christian Religion.

It was then moved by James Young, Esq. and seconded by Sir Charles Colville,

That the thanks of this Society be given to the worthy Secretary, the Rev. J. Joyce, for the promptitude that he evinced in summoning the Meeting upon this important occasion, and for his sincere and zealous discharge of the duties of his situation.

J. JOYCE, Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS adopted at a Meeting of the KENT and SUSSEX UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION, held at Northiam, 20th Oct. 1813.

Resolved,

I. That we thus publicly express our gratitude to the great Parent of all good, congratulate each other, and rejoice with the liberal-minded of all denominations, that a bill has been brought into Parliament and passed, so essential to the right of private judgment in religion, and the open avowal of what may result from it; freeing those who deny the doctrine of the Trinity from pains and penalties, and putting them under the protection of the law.

II. That we are highly gratified by the unanimity with which the above Bill passed the two Houses, and received the Royal Assent, flattering ourselves that it will be a prelude to the abolition of all political restrictions and distinctions on the ground of religion.

III. That receiving this fresh act of justice from the Legislature, whilst we relax not our exertions in the defence of the Divine Unity, and of supreme Worship as directed to the *One only living and true God*, we will be, *as ever*, equally exemplary for a respect to the peace, the good order, the prosperity and happiness of our country.

IV. That the thanks of this Association are due to, and that they be transmitted by the Chairman, with these Resolutions, to W. Smith, Esq. M. P. for his activity, zeal, and perseverance in promoting the above great object.

V. That the thanks of this Meeting are due to the Chairman, for his kind assistance, and able, and impartial conduct in the Chair.

LAWRENCE HOLDEN.

Tenterden, Oct. 21, 1813.

N. B. Transmitted to the Editor of the Repository by the request of the Association.

At a Meeting of the Southern Unitarian Society (for promoting the genuine knowledge of the Scriptures and the practice of virtue by the distribution of books), holden at the Unitarian Chapel, Newport, Isle of Wight, the 13th of October, 1813,

THOMAS COOKE, Esq. in the Chair,

The following Resolutions, in reference to the Act passed in the last session of Parliament, for the "*Relief of Persons who impugn the Doctrine of the Trinity*," were carried unanimously:

RESOLVED,

1. That it is the right of every man to worship God agreeably to the dictates of his conscience, and by all peaceable means to publish and defend his religious opinions, without being subject to any pains, penalties, or privations whatever.

2. That the principles of Religious Liberty, by which this right is recognized, were asserted at the Revolution; and have long been the glory of Englishmen.

3. That nevertheless, in opposition to these principles, persons denying the doctrine of the Trinity were first excluded from the benefits of the Toleration Act, by a clause in that Act itself: and afterwards by the statute of the 9th and 10th of William the Third, it was enacted, "That if any person or persons, having been educated in, or at any time having made profession of the Christian religion within this realm, shall, by writing, printing, teaching, or advised speaking, deny any one of the Persons in the Holy Trinity to be God, or shall assert or maintain there are more Gods than one, or shall deny the Christian religion to be true, or the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be of Divine authority; and shall, upon indictment or information in any of his Majesty's Courts of Westminster or at the assizes, be thereof lawfully convicted by the oath of two or more credible witnesses, such person or persons for the first offence shall be adjudged incapable and disabled in law to all intents and purposes whatsoever, to have or enjoy any office or offices, employment or employments, ecclesiastical, civil, or military, or any part in them, or any profit or advantage appertaining to them, or any of them. And if any person or persons so convicted as aforesaid, shall at the time of his or their conviction, enjoy or possess any office, place, or employment, such office, place, or employment, shall be void, and is hereby declared void. And if such person or persons shall be a second time lawfully convicted as aforesaid, of all or any of the aforesaid crime or crimes, that then he, or they shall from thenceforth be disabled to sue, prosecute, plead, or use any action or information in any court of law or equity, or to be guardian of any child, or executor or administrator of any person, or capable of any legacy or deed of gift, or to bear any office civil or military, or benefice ecclesiastical, for ever within this realm, and shall also suffer imprisonment for the space of three years, without bail or mainprize from the time of such conviction."

4. That we sincerely rejoice in the repeal of these acts as far as they thus affect ourselves, and of others still more severe, as affecting our Unitarian Brethren in Scotland; feeling that both they and we no longer owe our safety to a precarious connivance, but may publicly worship our Maker, and defend our opinions, under the full protection of the laws.

5. That our satisfaction in this legal recognition of our just rights is further encreased, when we reflect on the sufferings of persons who in past ages professed sentiments similar to those which we feel it our duty to avow.

6. That we are anxious, in the first place, to express our gratitude to the Almighty Disposer of Events for this signal instance of his protection and favour.

7. That our thanks are likewise due to all those Members of Parliament who were instrumental in obtaining this Act of the legislature in our behalf; particularly to that able and enlightened sentator, WILLIAM SMITH, Esq. for his zealous and persevering efforts not only on this occasion, but during a long political life devoted to the cause of civil and religious liberty.

8. That, as disciples of the same Master, we earnestly wish to hail the time when our Catholic brethren shall be exempted from religious restrictions and disabilities; and when all those penal laws, which tend to shackle the mind and enslave the conscience, shall, be expunged from the statute book.

9. That these Resolutions be sent for insertion to the Monthly Repository, and advertised in the Times, the Courier and Salisbury Journal.

THOMAS COOKE, Chairman.

10. That the thanks of this meeting be given to Thomas Cooke, Esq. for his able conduct in the Chair.

JOHN FULLAGAR, Secretary.

MONTHLY RETROSPECT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS;

OR

The Christian's Survey of the Political World.

Events since our last have crowded on us in such a manner as strike with awe and astonishment both the worldly politician and the sincere Christian. The glory of the mighty conqueror is cast down to the ground. His armies have been defeated, and he is returned to his capital a second time to appal his oppressed subjects with the heart-rending intelligence, that the armies of the enemy are approaching their territories, and that they, in their turn, will have to fight for their country and their independence. All Europe bowed not long ago to the nod of this mighty sovereign. He himself at last proclaims from his throne—All Europe is now against us:—and the bold language is held that France and himself would rise superior to every attack. France is likely indeed to see again upon her own soil the troops of a great confederacy, and it has no longer to resist them the mighty energy of soul, which arose from the feelings of liberty and independence breathed into her by the revolution.

Buonaparte was fixed in Dresden, making this place the *point d'appui* of his armies. The main force of the confederates was in Bohemia, and in the North the Crown Prince was at the head of a large army protecting Prussia, and threatening the country on the banks of the Elbe from Leipsic to Hamburgh. Instructed by former disasters the confederates moved with a decided plan to bear down with all their force upon the French in such a manner, as to surround them, and to compel them to fight under every disadvantage. The French Emperor saw through their plan, and was conscious, at the same time, of his own incapacity to render it ineffectual. To remain at Dresden was impossible, and he had already staid too long to give him a chance of extricating himself without immense loss. If he moved forward into Bohemia, the Crown Prince would gain the command of the Elbe, and cut off his retreat. If he marched against the Crown Prince, the confederate emperors would press upon him. To evacuate Dresden, and forsake the line of the Elbe, and march back into France without a battle, did not suit his lofty spirit, or the difficulties in executing such a plan might appear insuperable. On reviewing the whole there seems to have been vacillations in his mind, and to them probably he may now attribute the extent of his losses. He staid too long at Dresden, either to ensure victory or to make a safe retreat. If he could not fight the battle in Bohemia, it was in vain to expect success, when he was compelled to fight one in Germany against the united armies of his opponents.

On leaving Dresden, Buonaparte took the direction of Leipsic, carrying with him the King of Saxony and his family. The confederate emperors immediately marched their troops after him, and it was soon seen, that the neighbourhood of Leipsic would be signalised by a bloody field, to determine the fate of Europe in this mighty conflict. It is now said, that the arrangement of his troops was not such as might be expected from so experienced a commander: but this question must remain undecided even among military men, till a clearer account is given of the relative position of the armies before the horrible days of combat. Napoleon quitted Dresden on the 5th of October, and after various marches and counter-marches, the armies on both sides found themselves in the neighbourhood of Leipsic on the 16th, when the sanguinary battle began, which was completed on the 18th, with the total overthrow of Buonaparte's army, and the loss of an immense number of men, with nearly all his ammunition, guns and baggage. He is supposed to have lost sixty thousand men in these fatal days, and with the wreck of his army, between seventy and eighty thousand men, he made the best of his way back towards France.

So complete a defeat excited an expectation, that the retreating army might receive considerable molestation in its retreat, and hopes were entertained of the capture of the general.

But the victory was not obtained on the part of the confederates without great loss, and they required time for repose after their fatigues. Hence Buonaparte, by the rapidity of his movements, escaped from the main body of the confederates, and he palliated, in some degree, the disgrace of his defeat, by the victory he claimed over the Austro-Bavarian army, at Hanau. This army, by rapid marches, had followed the course of the Main on its right bank, with a view of intercepting Buonaparte in his flight, and had they been more numerous this battle would have put an end to the conflict. But Buonaparte was still powerful, and his cavalry far exceeded that of his opponents. They were driven from the plains of Hanau towards Aschaffenbourg with great loss, and Buonaparte boasted of the trophies which he had gained on that day, and which were sent to Paris to be laid at the feet of the Empress. But the French Emperor did not place much reliance on this success: for he continued his hasty route to Mentz, into which fortress he marched his troops, leaving only on the right bank of the Rhine a sufficient number of troops to guard his camp and fortifications at Cassel.

On the day after the great victory near Leipsic, the confederate emperors with the Crown Prince entered that town. The king of Saxony was there left to make what terms he could with the conquerors, and what will be his fate time must determine. He is now a prisoner to them, and his dominions are under the government of the confederate powers. A striking contrast to his situation about twenty years ago, when he received the emperor of Austria and the king of Prussia, and with them formed at Pilnitz the celebrated plan for controuling the power of France! What changes has he not experienced since that time! To France he owed his elevation to the rank of king—to France he owed a great accession of territory. With the humiliation of that country, which he was one of the first to attempt to depress, his own degradation is connected. Whether the confederates will permit him to reign or not, time must shew, yet probably he wanted opportunity only, not inclination, to desert his benefactor.

The triumph of the confederates was not owing entirely either to their bravery, numbers, or to the skill of their arrangements. The conflict might have terminated very differently, if treachery had not palsied the arm of their potent enemy. The German auxiliaries quitted him in the hottest of the conflict, and not only quitted him but turned the edge of their swords against him. It was impossible for him thus situated to pursue any effective plan, and all the skill he was master of, and the bravery of the troops of his own nation, were unable to extricate him on this trying occasion. The complaint of treachery served to diminish his failure in the eyes of his country, but the nations of Europe, wearied with the tyranny under which they have so long groaned, will not view with severity an action, to which they are so much indebted for the prospect of returning liberty.

The intentions of the conquerors with respect to Europe are not yet known. They must have complete possession of the countries, before they determine on their future government; and it remains to be seen, what efforts will be made by the French to regain their late unbounded influence on the continent. The military plans of the confederates are not as yet completely developed. The emperor of Austria has advanced as far as Hanau, and his advanced guard has had some affairs with the French at Cassel. An invasion of the French empire in that quarter may be expected, and as the inhabitants of the left bank of the Rhine are Germans, they may participate in the sentiments of their brethren on the right, and separate from the government, to which they have been for some time so intimately connected. Here then will be an opening into the territories of what was formerly called France, and the Prussians and Austrians may again try their fortunes on the plains of Champagne. The Crown Prince, who had so great a share in the glory of the battle of Leipsic, marches with his forces through Westphalia into Holland, where the inhabitants have anticipated his wishes, by taking upon themselves the recovery of their liberty and independence.

By being situated in an island we are dependent on the winds for our news from the continent, and at this interesting period they were singularly unfavourable to us. In fact we received through France the account of Buonaparte's return to his capital, and the victory he had obtained at Hanau. After a long delay a delegation arrived in England from Holland, communicating the welcome news of a great change that had taken place in that country. Holland has been very unhappily circumstanced not only during the revolution, but for some time previous to it. England and Prussia took part in the domestic concerns of that country, by which the party, called the Patriots, were driven out, and the Orange party, gaining the ascendancy, exercised in a very wanton manner the superiority it had obtained through foreign influence. The Patriots courted the interference of France, whose cabinet was too much occupied by its own concerns to grant them the relief they requested: but it gave them an asylum, and all the assistance that could be expected without coming to a rupture with the powers that had patronised the Stadtholder. When the French Revolution burst out, the Patriots availed themselves of it for a return into their own country; and then the Stadtholder himself, and a vast body of his adherents, shared a similar fate. They were in their turn driven out, and compelled to find an asylum in Great Britain and Prussia.

Since that time various changes have taken place among them. From a republic they have been converted into a kingdom, the kingdom has been removed, and they have become a province of France. Under French tyranny, the most adverse possible to all their former habits, and particularly to commercial industry, they have long groaned, and it is to be hoped that both Patriots and Orange-men have forgotten their ancient animosities and can unite cordially in support of their common country. The grounds of their variance are not generally known in this country, but they chiefly rest on this,—that one party was continually adding to the influence of the Orange family, whilst the other were for confining the head of it to the offices of Stadtholder and high admiral, within the limits of the law, and agreeably to the republican constitution of the government. At present the great point is to get rid of French tyranny, and in this the people seem to be generally united. The chief towns have driven away the French garrisons, and selected from themselves committees for the administration of the government. A delegation has also arrived in this country to communicate with our government and with the Prince of Orange on the subject of the change, and measures were taken to render Hollend all the assistance possible. A large force was to be sent thither with the Prince himself at their head, and as in the appointment of committees they looked to those, who were in the government in the year 1793, it is probable that the Prince will be invested in his office with all the powers belonging to it at that time. Already they begin to talk big, and think of the advantage of annexing the Netherlands to the United Provinces, to make a compact government: but they have much to do in forming a good government for themselves, and it is to be hoped that time has cooled their animosities, and that both parties, having smarted so long under a most oppressive tyranny, will learn to forget and forgive, and to unite in liberal concessions to each other for the good of the commonwealth.

The arrival of Buonaparte in his capital spread consternation over his kingdom, but nothing has openly appeared to indicate a decline in his authority. He has met his Conservative Senate, and has received addresses of a similar nature to those that are offered to crowned heads on the eve of their descent from the throne. He did not disguise the extent of the calamity that had befallen him, and his nation, in very plain language, pointed out the apprehensions they were under of an invasion of their country, and the necessity there was for every Frenchman arming in defence of its independence, and his own property. The example of Poland (that wicked act of original jacobinism) was held out to them, as a presage of what they might expect. The powers which partitioned Poland, were advancing into France, and without the utmost energy in defence of their common country, the horrors of Warsaw might, under another Suwarrow, be exhibited in its capital. A conscription of three hundred thousand men was enacted, and several financial edicts passed, which proved the distress to which the Emperor was brought, and it is evident, that whatever may be the success of the confederate powers, it will be impossible, for some time for him to rise from his abject situation, much less to attain to that height, from which it is to be hoped he is irrecoverably fallen. When on the banks of the Niemen he surveyed his gallant army, he proudly anticipated glorious triumphs, and additions to his coffers. All that he had accumulated has been lost in the last effort, and the countries whence he derived his resources, are falling from him. To proper France he must now look for support, and even in that country there may still be a feeling for liberty, which it will be impossible to keep under. There are forms sufficient by which the French may make known their sentiments, and this change may be as beneficial to them as to the rest of Europe. It is an awful time, and we shall see whether the late judgments have made the proper impression on the hearts of sovereigns and people. Both had much to learn, and the severe chastisement inflicted on them will, it is to be hoped, bring both to a proper sense of their duty, and teach them equally true loyalty, and a due sense of their situation in that dispensation of God, which authoritatively commands kings and people to become obedient to their common Saviour, the Prince of Peace.

The news of this wonderful change in the affairs of Europe was brought to England on the eve of the opening of the sessions of parliament, and afforded noble scope for the speech of the Prince Regent. The sentiments contained in it could not but be satisfactory to the whole nation. There was no presumptuous elevation, no degrading expressions on the fallen: "no disposition to require from France sacrifices of any description inconsistent with her honour or just pretensions as a nation;" and this sentiment was equally ascribed to the allies. Peace was looked to as the great blessing to be derived, but that could not be attained without farther exertions, and great pecuniary supplies were necessary for the subsidies to the allies. The war with America was lamented, and a readiness expressed to enter into discussion with that government for a conciliatory adjustment of all the differences between the two powers, on principles of perfect reciprocity, not inconsistent with the established maxims of public law, and with the maritime rights of the British empire.

Addresses were voted in both houses with great cordiality, which were followed by the grant of a large loan, and by new regulations respecting the militia, to render them more efficient in the great contest. Party seemed to be quite asleep, and joyful as such an event must be, it rendered the sittings of the houses less interesting, less occupied by debates. One subject engaged their attention, which materially affects the clergy, who have lately been harassed by *qui tam* actions, brought against them by an informer, who, from his late situation of bishop's secretary, enjoyed particula opportunities for his purposes. The plan was to derive an immense sum in fines from the clergy, who had not complied strictly to the letter of an act of parliament respecting residence; but the informer seems likely to be foiled; for a bill has been brought into parliament to stop all proceedings under that act, till the month of April, within which time, it is to be presumed, that some better regulations will be made to enforce the views of the legislature, without subjecting the clergy to the mercy of a common informer. It would seem strange, that the army and navy should be kept to their duty by *qui tam* actions, and it is equally absurd that the clergy should be exposed to them. They are all equally officers under the civil power, and may all be equally regulated by their superiors in their respective departments.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The length of some of the Miscellaneous Articles has quite excluded the Review

The Memoir of Mr. Bealey in our next Number.

We have the melancholy task of announcing to our readers the *death* of the Rev. Samuel Palmer, of Hackney, whose Memoir of Dr. Ashworth, and whose name, in another communication, appears in the present number. He

THE

MONTHLY REPOSITORY

OF

Theology and General Literature.

No. XCVI. DECEMBER. [Vol. VIII.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

A Memoir of the Rev. Joseph Bealey.

The Rev. **Joseph Bealey** was the third son of Mr. Joseph and Mrs. Ann Bealey, of Radcliffe, near Bury, in Lancashire: and was born there December 11th, 1756. Both his parents were persons of singular piety and goodness.

Of the piety and devotion of his father, the writer of this article has heard much.—He had the melancholy pleasure of a short interview with the good old man, a few days before he was removed from our world. Supported in his bed, oppressed with years and infirmities, yet cheerful and happy, he conveyed to the writer's mind, a strong and lively idea of the venerable Jacob, in dying circumstances, breathing out this pious ejaculation to his God, "I am waiting, for thy salvation, O Lord."

From such parents, he received what is of infinitely greater value, than the largest fortune or estate, a truly religious and Christian education. His disposition from his earliest years, was serious, benevolent, and pious, and he very soon in life made choice of the Christian ministry, as his future profession. It was the object of his strongest inclination, and he exerted all his energies, and the excellent natural abilities, with which Providence had endowed him, to become qualified for performing its duties with credit and usefulness.

He received his classical education, under the Rev. R. Smalley, of Darwin, near Blackburn: a gentleman, for whom he ever retained the highest respect and reverence, and who, if we may judge from the acquirements of his pupil, was a scholar of no inferior class. When he left Mr. Smalley, he entered upon his academical studies, under the eminent Dr. Ashworth, in the Dissenters' college at Daventry, in Northamptonshire; but the Dr. dying soon after the commencement of Mr. Bealey's course, he pursued and completed them under the Rev. Thos. Robins.

Whilst at the academy, he deported himself in every respect, so suitably to his character as a candidate for the sacred ministry, that he conciliated the esteem and affection of his fellow-students, and of all who knew him, as well as the distinguished regard and friendship of his very amiable and excellent tutor.

On his leaving Daventry, he first settled with a serious and respectable society at Narborough, in Leicestershire, as successor to the late Rev. Mr. Urwick, of Clapham. He remained here but a short time, for on the removal of the late excellent Dr. Barnes to Manchester, he succeeded him in Feb. 1781, in the pastoral care of the congregation of Protestant Dissenters at Cockey Moor, near Bolton, in his native county of Lancaster. On the removal of Dr. Enfield to Norwich, Mr. Bealey accepted an invitation to become the minister of the congregation at Warrington, and removed thither in May, 1786. In this place he was greatly respected and beloved, and established a high character as a Christian, a minister, and a scholar.

The late godlike philanthropist John Howard, Esq. printing his valuable works here, Mr. Bealey acquired his acquaintance and friendship; he superintended the press for the impression of the Treatise on Lazarettos; and was presented with this and the Account of Prisons, elegantly bound, by their benevolent author, accompanied by a declaration of high affection and respect. After a residence of more than five years at Warrington, he returned to his former charge at Cockey Moor, in September, 1791, and to the benefit of that society his valuable labours have ever since been devoted. Perhaps few ministers have been more observant than he was, of the apostle's injunction—"Take heed to thyself and to thy doctrine, continue in them, for in doing this, thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." He always maintained a most exemplary conduct and character, and was remarkably diligent in performing all the duties of his office.

He always prepared his discourses with great care, and from the stores of his well-furnished mind poured into them a rich variety of just and important thoughts, expressed in plain, manly, and not inelegant language, and arranged in the most natural and lucid order. It has often been remarked concerning him, "Mr. Bealey never delivers a poor sermon." As the subjects on which he chiefly dwelt in the pulpit were those in which mankind have the greatest interest; as his voice was remarkably pleasing, and his delivery very solemn; he was generally an acceptable preacher to candid and serious Christians of all denominations.

His devotional services were singularly excellent: a copious and delightful vein of pious sentiments ran through them, expressed in words the most suitable; every thing in his manner shewed that his whole soul was engaged in these sacred exercises, and it seemed impossible for any one to listen to his devotions without partaking of devotional feelings, or being constrained to pray. He was "instant in season and out of season;" besides the stated services of the Lord's day, he often preached lectures at different places in the neighbourhood, on week-day evenings, which were generally well-attended, and very conducive to the promotion of Christian knowledge and holiness, within the widely-extended circle of his very scattered congregation.

He took great pains to know the real state of his flock, and attended with remarkable care to every case which required the peculiar notice of a pastor.

He frequently and affectionately visited the sick, acting in the double capacity, for which he was well qualified, of physician both to body and mind. He had bestowed great pains in the study of the healing art, and was often consulted by persons labouring under disease, of all ranks and conditions around him. The good he did in this way was incalculable; it is believed he gave to all, but certainly to all but the rich, both his advice and medicine. For many years before his death, he appropriated one afternoon in every week to the gratuitous vaccination of children, and the numbers that were brought to him on these occasions were very great. Most liberally and cheerfully did he impart to the indigent of the substance which God had given him; and he heartily entered into every scheme which had for its object the relief of the wretched and necessitous, and the instruction of the young and ignorant. The instruction of the youth of his society and the children of the poor around him was indeed an object of his principal attention.

Hence, after the pattern of his beloved and honoured friend, Dr. Barnes, he for several years met the young men of the congregation, in a large room contiguous to the chapel, on a Thursday evening, and lectured to, or rather conversed with them in regular order, on the evidences, the doctrines, and duties, of natural and revealed religion, and the means of virtuous improvement. Hence too he bestowed great pains in catechising; and ever since the establishment of a Sunday school in his society, he regularly spent about two hours every Lord's day morning, when he was at home, before he entered on the public labours of the day, in the school; superintending its management; calling up to him each class in its turn; teaching, admonishing or encouraging, as circumstances required.

After the afternoon service in the chapel, he again repaired to the school, and closed its exercises for the day with a short prayer, and a few hints of advice to the children. It was the great concern of his heart to be doing good, and his delight when an opportunity presented itself.

Though he was a 'master in Israel,' and could edify and delight the most judicious and best informed Christians, he disdained not to consult the information and improvement of the youngest and the meanest understandings.

Like his Divine Master, he fed the lambs and gently supported and led the feeble of the flock. His genius was solid and good, his understanding clear, his judgment strong, his memory faithful, and his learning very considerable and various. His passions, naturally cool, were brought under the most exact regulation. His diligence, resolution, and perseverance were uncommonly great. His heart was remarkably honest; his friendship sincere; and his tongue under the guidance of wisdom and prudence. An inflexible integrity formed the basis of his character, and governed and directed his actions. Hence originated that careful, that impartial, that indefatigable, that truly painful investigation which led to the late change in his theological opinions; and the ingenuous open avowal of the sentiments he had adopted, though he expected, as indeed he experienced, that this avowal would be made at the expence of much that was very dear to his heart.

Until within the last year and half of his life, Mr. Bealey was a zealous Arian, or, as persons of his line of sentiment choose rather to be called, a Clarkean. Like many other pious Christians who have seen little of Unitarians, and but imperfectly understand their system, he entertained very strong prejudices against their principles. He conceived them to be frigid, unfriendly to piety, and contrary to the obvious language of scripture. Towards the close of the year 1811, he read the Rev. Thomas Belsham's Calm Inquiry, then just published, and was greatly surprised at the assertion of the author, that the Greek word Γινομαι is never used in the sacred writings to express creation out of nothing. He intimated his surprise in a letter to a minister who had been the companion of his early studies and his constant friend, who had now become an Unitarian, in the limited sense in which, perhaps it is rather to be regretted, the term is now used. His friend in reply, declared it to be his belief that Mr. Belsham's assertion is well-founded, and requested Mr. Bealey to point out either in the Septuagint, or the New Testament, any texts in which the word in question has clearly the meaning for which he contended. This put him upon a critical examination, for which, few persons were better qualified than himself, of all the passages in the Greek scriptures where the word occurs. The consequence was, he became perfectly satisfied that Mr. Belsham is accurately right, and frankly told his friend, "that he now clearly saw, that all those passages which he had formerly understood to ascribe creation to Christ, implied not the *natural* but the *moral* creation or *renovation of the world.*" "I then (says he,* to state his own candid and manly avowal) felt it to be my duty to enter into a more serious and close examination into the grounds of the general system which I had long adopted, and into the scriptural evidence which there is for what is commonly called the Unitarian doctrine, with respect to the person of Christ; against which I ought to be ashamed to acknowledge that I had hitherto indulged a general prejudice, so far as to prevent my giving it a fair and full examination. After much anxious, and I hope I may add, serious and faithful application of my best powers of judgment to the subject, I was at length constrained to renounce the views which I had entertained with regard to the person of Christ, and brought to a full conviction that he was in nature only a man, though eminently distinguished from all other men, both by the unparalleled excellency of his character, and by the high dignity and importance of his office, as well as by the extraordinary powers with which he was invested; and firmly believing this to be the genuine doctrine of the gospel, I cannot but feel it to be my indispensable duty, by all fair and honourable means, to recommend it to the attention of others, and to endeavour to promote its diffusion among my fellow Christians. A consciousness of the prejudices which I have myself too much indulged, though I trust not from any wilfully wrong motives, ought indeed to make me exceedingly candid towards those who are still subject to their unhappy influence; but at the same time, I think it ought to render me the more earnest in my endeavours to persuade them to divest themselves of all improper prepossessions and to examine the scriptures fairly and impartially in order to learn from thence what are the genuine truths of the gospel."

---

* Sermon at Cross-Street, Manchester. [Reviewed in pp. 613 and 615 of the present Vol. Ed.]

By this open avowal of his sentiments and his efforts to promote their spread, he knew that he should incur the censure of the world, the displeasure of some of his nearest and dearest relatives, the alienation of friendships he greatly valued, and perhaps the dissatisfaction of a very considerable part of his congregation: but none of these things moved him. In a manner the farthest possible from every thing like temporizing, the most undisguised and dignified, yet always in the spirit of meekness, and under the guidance of prudence, he shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God, and by the manifestation of what appeared to him to be the truth in Jesus, to commend himself to every man's conscience as in the sight of God. His zeal was at once enlightened and active.

To his other numerous labours on Lord's days, he added, through the whole of last winter, lectures, one a fortnight, in the evening, on the unity of God, and the nature, character, and offices of Christ. These lectures which were drawn up with the greatest care and ability, were attended by numerous and attentive auditories, during the whole course of their delivery. He also established other meetings on weekday evenings, at his friends' houses in various parts of the neighbourhood, besides those before mentioned, for the purpose of preaching on the doctrines of the gospel, or expounding the scriptures, at which he also had generally many hearers. The outcry raised against him by the ignorant, the bigoted, and the interested, was, as he had expected, loud and violent; the grossest misrepresentations were made of the doctrines he taught; and *some* who had the best opportunity of knowing his sincerity and worth, and had ever discovered a high value for his religious services, at once broke off all connection with him as a minister, and were not *over* cordial with him as a friend. The great excellencies of his character, however, improved by his Unitarian principles, as some who are not by any means friendly to them have been heard to acknowledge, his ardent elevated piety, his warm benevolence, the catholic spirit he breathed towards all who differed from him, and his constant concern and aim to do good, greatly lessened men's prejudices both against himself and his sentiments.

He had the satisfaction to find but very few of his people desert his ministry, and that as he himself stated in the preface to a sermon,* published at their request and expence, in consequence "of hearing with fairness and candour what he had to advance in favour of the religious opinions which he had adopted, as well as reading the arguments which have been urged in support of the Unitarian doctrines by others, no small number of those who were at first, greatly prejudiced against them were brought to embrace them from a full conviction that they are the genuine doctrines of the Christian revelation."

It may not be improper to add, that since the publication of this sermon, Unitarianism has made a still greater progress in the society at Cockey-Moor, indeed it has been so generally embraced, that with the exception of fewer than a dozen individuals, the people have been unanimous, since the lamented death of their excellent pastor, in expressing their determination to choose a strictly Unitarian successor.

Since the death of Dr. Barnes, Mr. Bealey has had the principal management of the Widows' Fund, belonging to, as they are commonly called, the Presbyterian ministers of Lancashire and Cheshire; and from the impulse of the warm benevolence of his heart, and by his singular aptitude for business, he supplied the place of his active and energetic predecessor in conducting its affairs, in a manner that entitled him, to what he certainly possessed, the esteem and gratitude of every member of the institution. With such diligence and success did this wise and skilful, this good and faithful servant of Jesus Christ, labour in the service of his great Master; and from the general state of his health for the last several years, and his standing in life, his friends had indulged the pleasing hope, that the church and the world would have enjoyed the benefit of his example and services for a considerable time to come. But it pleased an all-wise Providence to determine otherwise; and as we had been taught by the life of this excellent man how the Christian, and Christian minister should live, so, in his death we "see how the Christian can die," though taken away in the midst of his days, reputation and usefulness.

As while living he had exhibited a pattern of becoming zeal for the promotion of truth, so he displayed its power to support and cheer the mind, when dying. Mr. Bealey was seized by what was pronounced, a nervous fever, about Midsummer last. Several times during the month of July, his friends thought him better; and his nearest relatives had no apprehension of his death, till a little more than a week before that melancholy event took place.

He died August the 9th, in the 57th year of his age. His frame of mind was remarkably serene and happy through his whole illness; the result of an entire resignation to the will of God, a sense of his favour, and the hope of a blessed immortality. "I have no wish," said he, to a near and beloved relative, "I have no wish separated from the will of God; if he please to *remove* me from the world, *that* is my

---

* Christ a Man of Sorrows. [Reviewed pp 613 and 615 of the present Vol. Ed.]

desire; if he see it good that I should continue longer in life, *that* is my *wish*." During the whole period of his sickness, whilst reason remained, he expressed, both to the writer of this, and to others, the most thorough conviction of the truth, the importance, and the value of the views of Christianity he had embraced. Speaking to a respected visiting relative, as he afterwards related the conversation to the present writer, of the apprehensions entertained by his friends, that the exertions he had used to promote the spread of the opinions he had lately adopted, had been the occasion of his illness, he said—"so thoroughly am I satisfied that the sentiments I have received are God's truth; of so much importance to mankind do I deem them; and so pleased am I in reflecting on what I have done to propagate them, that I do most solemnly declare, that had I been assured at the time I made those exertions, that this indisposition would be the consequence, I would still have made them." Speaking to his friend who writes this, a few days before his death, of the influence of his religious principles, he said, "I have never been so truly happy in my life as during the last half-year; and never have I enjoyed during any former illness, the peace and joy I have experienced through this. I have proved what Unitarian principles will do, and I find them all-powerful, to support and console the mind under affliction, and in the prospect of death." At another time he remarked, "Our system, my friend, is greatly misunderstood: persons imagine that we depend for acceptance with God, and the happiness of heaven, on the merit of our good works: No,"—with peculiar animation of voice and manner—"Our dependance is placed on the free, the unmerited, unpurchased grace and mercy of God, declared unto the world by Jesus Christ our Lord, and confirmed by his death and resurrection: Here I rest my dependance, and I am sure that I am safe."

As this truly excellent person was greatly esteemed, honoured and revered while he lived, so, his death is lamented *by all* who knew him, whose mental sight, prejudice and bigotry have not blinded to all true excellence of character, destroying the best sensibilities of the heart.

"The stranger pays the tribute of a good word, and drops an honest tear; whilst neither words nor tears can express the sorrow of more intimate acquaintances and friends."

The writer, cannot help subjoining to this tribute of respect to the memory of his beloved friend, his own deliberate wish and fervent prayer, expressed in the words in which Dr. Bates concludes his account of Mr. Baxter and his dying behaviour, in his funeral sermon for that great and good man; who, like Mr. Bealey, was aspersed and calumniated by some, and the safety of whose everlasting condition they affected to doubt, on account of his dereliction from some of the dogmas of pseudo-orthodoxy—"May I live the remainder of my life as entirely to the glory of God as he lived; and when I come to the period of it, may I die in the same blessed peace wherein he died; may I be with him in the kingdom of light and love for ever."

When such useful and valuable ministers are removed from the world, it is consoling to reflect, that God ever lives to watch over the affairs of his church, and to support and guard the interest of truth and righteousness; and that he can never be at a loss for means and instruments to promote his own cause.—Yet let such mournful events stimulate the diligence of the ministers that yet remain, and lead both them and their people to pray the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth other faithful labourers into it, to supply the places of those who are dismissed to their rest.

Mr. Bealey married, March 13th, 1783, Miss Ann Kay, daughter of Mr. John Kay, a respectable clothier, of Bury, Lancashire, "with whom he lived in the most perfect harmony and mutual affection, which were uninterrupted to the last moment of his life; and who survives him only by the imitation of his virtues to prepare for that world where they will part no more.*" By this lady he had many children, four of whom are still alive to comfort and bless their mother, by acting in a manner worthy of their relation to such a father, and of the instructions and example they received from him.

Mr. Bealey was interred in his own chapel-yard, at Cockey-Moor, on Friday, the 12th of August. A very considerable number of his numerous congregation, of both sexes and of different ranks and ages, joined the funeral procession, and shewed by indubitable signs their sense of the loss they have sustained, and the deep sorrow they felt. Six gentlemen, principal members of the society, received the corpse on their shoulders at the gates, and bore it through the yard, which is extensive, to the chapel.

The service was performed by two intimate friends of the deceased, the Rev. John Holland, of Bolton, and Mr. Allard, of Bury.

On Sunday the 19th, so large a concourse of people assembled at the chapel to hear the funeral sermon, that soon after the service began, there was an alarm given, that the galleries were giving way; but the people being prevailed upon to go out of the place without any very violent rush, no serious injury happened to any one; and Mr. Allard delivered the sermon, from Heb. xiii. 7, in the Chapel-yard, to a vast, attentive, and deeply affected congregation.

After the sermon the following hymn was sung, slightly altered from the original, sung at Birmingham, in the year 1769, after Dr. Ashworth's funeral sermon for Mr. Clark.

While deep distress invades each heart,
And sorrow gushes from our eyes,
Great God, thy powerful aid impart,
Teach us thy ways are good and wise.

Fain would we bow beneath thy rod,
And every friend to thee resign;
Thou art our Father and our God,
And all our dearest hopes are thine.

What though we see our friend no more,
No more attend his pleasing voice;
With him again we may adore,
With him in heaven we may rejoice.

A pious pleasure fills the mind
While we reflect on all his ways;
To think we here so oft have join'd
In fervent pray'r,—in thankful praise,

---

* Rev. J. Yates's Funeral Sermon for Dr. Barnes.

Strike deep in ev'ry mournful breast,
O God, the solemn truths he spoke!
May our whole lives be thus impress'd;
And we will bless the awful stroke.

And may we strive like him we mourn,
Each ruder passion to controul;
May equal love and goodness burn,
And take possession of the soul!

Mr. Bealey published

1. Observations upon the Rev. Mr. Owen's Sermon, Preached in the Parish Church at Warrington, on the 30th of Jan. 1790.— An admirable pamphlet, in which he ably advocates the Dissenters and their cause; it is a pity that it is not more known.

2. The Opposite Ends of the Righteous and the Wicked; illustrated in Two Sermons, preached at Cockey-moor; the former on the 24th March, 1805, upon the death of William Smith, a religious weaver, of Harwood, near Bolton. And the latter on the 7th April, upon the Execution of John Lever, who was hanged at Lancaster, on the preceding Monday, for the murder of John Ashworth, of Radcliffe. 1805.

3. A Funeral Discourse for the Rev. Thomas Barnes, D. D. on John v. and 35. with an Address at his Interment. 1810.

4. Two Discourses, the former of which was preached at the Unitarian Chapel, in Mosley-Street, Manchester, on Wednesday Evening, the 30th Dec. 1812, before the Members of the Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Book and Tract Society, at their Annual Meeting; and the latter at the Protestant Dissenters' Chapel, in Cross-Street, Manchester, on Sunday the 10th of January, 1813.

5. Jesus Christ a Man of Sorrows, and acquainted with Grief; A Sermon, preached at the Protestant Dissenters' Chapel, at Cockey, in Ainsworth, on the 4th of April, 1813.

W. A.

Bury, Lancashire, Nov. 5, 1813.

[Mr. Bealey wrote the Memoir of the late Rev. Dr. Barnes, in M. Repos. Vol. V. pp. 408—412.

He and the late Rev. Samuel Palmer, of Hackney, were mutually esteemed friends; and the Editor cannot refrain from inserting here a note which he received from the latter gentleman, only a week preceding his death. He had applied to the Editor for the loan of Mr. Bealey's two Unitarian publications (the 4th and 5th in the foregoing list), and at the same time communicated the letter inserted in our last (p. 714) on the Review of "Dr. Watts no Socinian." The Editor sent him the Sermon (No. 5), promising the two Sermons (No. 4), at a future period: he also apprized Mr. Palmer of his having received the Strictures (inserted pp. 715—723), and added a reason or two why he thought with the Reviewer in this work (p. 683) that the use of the term *Socinian* was unjustifiable: Mr. Palmer replied, in the following note, written on the 20th of November.

"*Saturday Night.*

"I thank you, my dear Sir, for the loan of Mr. Bealey's Sermon, and for the Note which accompanied it.—I read the Sermon with a melancholy pleasure. I preached at his ordination at Narborough, when he delivered the most rigid Calvinistical confession I ever heard from a Daventry pupil. I lament his death more than his change of sentiment. His discourse affords proof not only of good ability, but of an amiable and pious mind.—I shall be glad to see the other two, when you can find them; and if they were to be bought in London, I would buy them all. Strange that they should not.—I am willing to hear and to read whatever may be calmly and candidly said or written against what I have published.—What you say deserves attention, but does not quite convince me. What modern Calvinist would approve of Calvin's persecuting spirit! I cannot think of any fitter name for you than *modern Socinians.*—But no more now from your friend

S. PALMER."

The Editor cannot reflect upon the light controversy carrying on in this work, between Mr. Palmer and others, at the time of Mr. Palmer's decease, without feeling a renewed conviction that there are pursuits still more important than theological controversy, and that theological controversy cannot be conducted too mildly and gently.

Dec. 1. Ed.]

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

On "The Dissenting Minister's Complaint."

Sir,

In your Repository for June (p. 366), I read with no small degree of interest, and with mingled sentiments of concern and respect, "The Dissenting Minister's Complaint;" which stated a case of great hardship with such strong and artless simplicity, as I thought must have carried a conviction of its reasonableness and truth, home to every feeling bosom; and I hoped might in some degree have been instrumental in removing the grievance which it laments, by calling the attention of the wealthier members of Dissenting congregations, to the difficulties and discouragements which many of their ministers labour under.

Expecting that some one of your lay correspondents would have espoused the cause and reinforced its arguments, how was I surprised and shocked at the harsh manner in which the matter is taken up (in the Repository for Sept. p. 593) by Verax, who, though professing himself to be one who has "endeavoured both by example and exhortation" to promote the desirable change which the complainant pleads for, comes forward with angry invectives, calling a sufferer "querulous and uncandid," because he has dared to mention the narrowness or inconsideration of "those who live at ease, and roll in carriages," who find even "a quilted pew" in the chapel necessary to their vain or idle habits, and think large sums well bestowed in enabling their daughters to appear with advantage in the fashionable world! because he has ventured to hint that persons so circumstanced, must come forward in a *liberal* manner, and support their ministers in comfort and respectability, unless they mean soon "to abandon the religion they profess to love, or have their pulpits filled with men whose services will be irksome to them." Verax goes on to suppose that the complainant chose the profession of a *Dissenting* minister with a view of *making a fortune*, with what *probability* I leave your readers to judge. He "cannot admit it to be true that stipends have lowered," but *believes* that in *most* instances they have been raised: but admitting this, as I sincerely hope it is, to be true in general, though not in the instance of the complainant; suppose the income of a minister to have been raised a third in the last thirty years, still if the necessaries of life are raised two-thirds, which is the least that we can say; he who never had more than a very moderate competence, must now be reduced to a state bordering upon poverty. Such a situation Verax owns, "calls for commiseration," but he reminds the sufferer, that the great mass of his hearers, are from the "expences of the days in which we live, scarcely able to spare from the wants of their own families, that portion which they give to their ministers."

Was instruction in that science, the true knowledge of which is beyond all price, justly regarded by the heads of families, they would spare, in many ways, rather than take from the sum which is necessary for the adequate support of him whom they have chosen as the teacher of themselves, and those dependent upon them. But it is not this class who are chiefly called upon; it is, I again repeat it, the part of those who "live at ease," to come liberally forward, and by placing him in comfortable circumstances with respect to this world's goods, leave their pastor's mind at liberty to exert its full powers for the spiritual welfare of his flock. As for the "auxiliary labours" which are the usual resources of learned men in narrow circumstances, the instruction of youth is certainly a most honourable and useful employment, and there are minds of such strength and activity as to render an attention to it in a great degree compatible with the numerous avocations of a zealous and affectionate minister: but the constitution often fails under such a load of mental occupation, and a valuable life is spent by over exertion, before it has run out half its natural length. Where a congregation is able to maintain two ministers, *one* may well employ a large part of his time in the education of its younger members; but where all rests upon one, there must be neglect somewhere, or the melancholy consequence I have just mentioned will generally follow.

Nor is every good and learned man, fitted by inclination and temper for a schoolmaster; and when that office is undertaken unwillingly, and from necessity, it is a slavery hardly to be conceived, and its important duties can never be properly fulfilled.

I am not pleading for the maintenance of an idle or luxurious ministry: my earnest desire is to see in them and in their families, that plain simplicity of manners and appearance, which adorns the holy profession they have chosen, and renders them shining "examples to the flock." Without this indeed, their exhortations can be expected to avail but little for the advancement of the Christian cause. A careless or worldly-minded minister, with a *fashionable* wife, and *highly accomplished* daughters, whatever his abilities may be, will seldom reform the hearts and lives of his hearers; for we can hardly infuse into others, that piety which is not the *leading* principle in our own breasts; but I should rejoice to see every congregation zealous in supplying that measure of "carnal things," which will enable their pastor to bring up his family in comfort and respectability. If he is satisfied with his own condition, it will induce him like the father of the complainant, to lead the mind of his son to prefer the noble and pious pursuits of a Christian teacher, to the more lucrative professions which on all sides present themselves to his choice.

A man may from mere worldly motives bring up his son to the Established Church, for it has so much to bestow, that ability and good conduct can hardly fail of obtaining high honours and an ample income to one who will zealously defend its doctrines; nay, we have instances of very moderate talents having enabled those who set out from humble stations in life, to reach even its most splendid dignities! But as a *Dissenter*, nothing more than an easy competence *can* be gained by the most arduous and unremitting exertions; so that the motives which induce a father to educate a child expensively for such a destination, or a son earnestly to desire it, must have something in them very different from *worldly policy*.

What right then can we have to expect a constant and increasing supply of such men as are requisite for the demands of congregations, annually becoming more numerous and enlightened, unless we each, according to our different means, evince our attachment to them, and our gratitude for their services, by something more substantial than "a cordial shake of the hand," or "tender inquiries" respecting the welfare of those whose reasonable demands we do not afford them the means of supplying. If our minister labours to make us good, let us in return strive to render him happy. This is the spirit that ought to animate a pastor and his people, and I trust it is spreading amongst us. May it speedily reach the complainant; may the liberality of his flock enable him to give up "teaching Latin rudiments and English grammar," and return to those delightful pursuits and studies, which will render him more fully competent to be their friend and adviser with respect to the concerns of this world, and their faithful guide to a blessed immortality in the next.

I remain, Sir,
Your's respectfully,
M. H.

Mr. Sturch, in Reply to A. L. B. on the Scriptures.†

December 3, 1813.

Sir,

In proportion as the number of your correspondents encreases, it becomes of more importance that whoever is desirous of making your valuable miscellany the medium of communication with the public, should be careful to study brevity, as far as may be consistent with justice to his subject. If this remark had occurred to the gentleman who has, at length, assumed the signature of A. L. B. and who, as he doubtless means well, it may be hoped will soon feel bold enough to give us his real name, he would have omitted at least one half of the long letter which you have been under the necessity of dividing into two parts, in order to afford it admission: since more than one half of it, though it purports to be a "comment on Mr. S's paper," has no sort of relation to any thing that I had said, and might as well have been tacked to an essay on any other subject. For instance, he descants at great length on the imperfection of human reason, and assures us that "it does not afford a *sure* criterion of right," and "that it has at different times, formed and adopted creeds, as different from each other as light from dark;" positions which I never thought of denying, and which I suppose nobody ever doubted. It may however, not be improper to remark, by the way, that whether the imperfection of reason be more or less, it must *necessarily* be our director and judge, in the study of the book of scripture, as well as the book of nature; *because we have no other*; and history shews, that it is no less liable to form "opposite opinions" and "jarring speculative theories" in the former case, than in the latter. He then thinks fit to entertain your readers with a dissertation on the power of conscience, and another on the morality of savages; on neither of which I had offered a single word. Afterwards he tells you, that he has "to *defend* his assertion, that a religious motive alone can sanctify any, even our best actions." Against whom has he to defend it? Not, surely, against me; for I will venture to say there is not a syllable in my observations on his paper, which can be twisted into any thing like a denial of this assertion.

---

† The "Dialogue on our Obligation to Study the Scriptures," appeared in pp. 103—107 of this Volume: Mr. Sturch's Animadversions on the Dialogue, pp. 297—300; and A. L. B's. "Vindication of the Dialogue," pp. 650—653, and 738—741. Ed.

Your correspondent, however, though the greater part of his letter is quite foreign to the main point in which I differed from him, has, in the little that relates to it,—I dare say unintentionally,—done me the greatest injustice. He concludes, from my objecting to eternal punishment, that I am not half so familiar with the scriptures, as he thinks I am with the pages of philosophy; whereas he ought to know, and it is surprising that he does not know, that there have been many diligent readers of the scriptures, eminent for learning and abilities, who have endeavoured to shew, and have succeeded in convincing thousands of sincere Christians, that they contain nothing favourable to the common opinion, that the punishment of the wicked will be in the strict sense of the word, *eternal*. He tells you also, that "Mr. S. never looks on the scriptures in any other light than as a book of *mere* human origin;" that "Mr. S. cannot *honestly* recommend them to any living being"—that "Mr. S. would willingly substitute books of philosophy for the collection called the scriptures"—that "he seems to think it a matter of great indifference whether people even read the latter or not"—and that "in his estimation the scriptures must be capable of doing the *greatest harm.*" All this he tells us, in the very face of my explicit declaration, that, "I would *not fail* to recommend them to the *particular attention* of his friend, as containing (with other matter of inferior value) A MOST VALUABLE TREASURE OF THEOLOGICAL, MORAL, AND POLITICAL SCIENCE." But, Sir, it is so common for polemics to treat each other unfairly, that I ought to beg your pardon, especially after my recommendation of brevity, for troubling you with these complaints of injustice.

The object of my letter, as I plainly stated, was, to take notice of an important assertion, which appeared to me to be not only wholly unfounded, but extremely pernicious; namely, that "reason did not teach that revenge was a crime; and that the discovery that it is so, could be made by no other means, through no other channel than the scripture." In opposition to this I affirmed, that the duty of forgiving injuries, or the unlawfulness of revenge, is agreeable to right reason;—is a portion of the law of improved and cultivated nature (I did not say of savage ignorance), and was actually received and taught as such, before the Christian era, by those who had no other means of acquainting themselves with religious and moral truth, than the exercise of their own faculties, assisted by the experience and observation of others.

I have not merely *affirmed* this, Sir, but I must be permitted to say, I have *proved* it, by indisputable evidence; and our well-meaning friend A. L. B. is so sensible of this, so thoroughly convinced that he was in the wrong, that he frankly confesses, that when he made the controverted assertion, he *spoke too much at large;* and that Mr. S. has made evident by his quotations, that in the long course of time a few men have existed, who thought that we ought not to be greatly offended with our enemies. The rash assertion then, that "through no other channel than the scriptures could the discovery be made," must be abandoned; and our controversy is closed.

A little reluctance, however, to give up a favourite point must be expected. Accordingly, our friend thinks that the *number* of those who could discover moral truth by the light of nature, seems to have been *small*; and if none but a few "favoured mortals" could do so, he wishes to know, "what would the bulk of men, less intellectual, or less enquiring, have done?" With your leave, Sir, I will tell him. They would do well to *learn*, as no doubt they did, of those who were wiser than themselves; who, by the way, were far more numerous than he imagines; for he is mistaken if he supposes that I have brought forward a tenth part of the authorities that I had in store. By what means have the sciences, and the various arts of life, been communicated to so large a portion of the world? The million are clearly incapable of acquiring them by their native sagacity; and your correspondent will not, I suppose, maintain, that they could be discovered, "through no other channel than the scriptures." How, for instance, did the world become acquainted with geometry, or with arithmetic? Scarcely one in fifty thousand can be supposed capable of inventing even the simplest axioms, or the four first rules. Almost all, however, have sufficient capacity to be convinced of their truth by competent instructors; and it has seemed good to Divine Providence, to raise up from time to time, men of "superior penetration" and industry, who have been able to make discoveries, not for their own use alone, but for the benefit of the world. An Archimedes, an Euclid, a Newton, with many others of inferior note, have arisen in different ages, and have gradually increased the stock of human knowledge; and there can, I think, be no reasonable doubt, that moral science was carried on towards perfection in the same way.

All this, your correspondent will say, confirms his opinion, that I consider the scriptures as a book of mere human origin.—But he tells you, he has "yet to learn what *degree* of importance Mr. S. is disposed to attach to them;" and on this head I am perfectly willing to gratify his curiosity, and to lay before him my confession of faith in the Bible. Let him be informed then, that I do *not* believe with him, that the whole of this multifarious collection of writings "rests on the same evidence;" or that "it is uniformly and minutely true;" or that it is all divinely inspired; for this reason amongst others, that though I find *revenge* expressly *forbidden* in some parts of this collection, yet in other parts of it, I find the same odious passion, in its most horrid and disgusting forms, *recommended and encouraged*, by the highest praise, and the warmest exhortations; from whence I conclude with certainty, that the whole could not have been dictated by the *same* spirit.* Nor do I find it asserted in any part of that collection, that "all scriptures were written by inspiration of God," although something like it appears in one passage of that incorrect version which is in common use. Farther I do *not* believe that these writings are the only sources of moral and religious knowledge, or the only means of saving men from everlasting torments; because, I cannot consent to libel and defame the great and good Author of my being, by maintaining that he leaves a vast majority of mankind in a state of invincible ignorance of their duty, and then consigns them to eternal damnation for not performing it. Nevertheless, *I do* believe, that this collection is of *inestimable value*: not only as preserving the most authentic records of the early history of mankind; but also, as containing credible accounts of supernatural communications from God to his erring creatures, and throwing a most splendid light on subjects of the highest interest to human beings, which were before veiled in *comparative* obscurity. With these views of the Bible, I trust, our friend A. L. B. will allow me to prefer it to the "Arabian Nights," or to "Miss Edgeworth's Tales," and even to recommend it to my children, without suffering his kind concern for "the credit of my understanding, consistency, and independence of character," to distress his mind, or to impair his health.

---

* See Deut. xxv. 17, 18, 19. 1 Sam. xv. 2, 3. Psalm cxxxvii. 8, 9.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
W. STURCH.

Strictures on a recent Publication of Mr. Palmer's. No. II.

[The Editor of a periodical publication and his correspondents are sometimes presented with more impressive instances of mortality than occur to persons in other situations. It will occasionally happen that the very Number which contains communications from a much esteemed friend, or in relation to him, announces the intelligence of his death, and that before the observations to which his works have given rise can be completed for the eyes of the world, his own " thoughts are broken off—the purposes of his heart,"—and he is removed beyond *the din of controversy and the din of war!* How forcibly these remarks apply to the time and circumstances of the appearance of the above *Strictures, &c.* our readers need not to be informed.

" Were the contents of this paper personal, instead of being *argumentative*, the Letter now printed, would assuredly have been withholden." For making this declaration, we have the authority of the writer. " He had a great regard for Mr. Palmer: he mourns sincerely over his grave; and, were this the proper place, he could speak with ease and pleasure of his various excellencies. Truth and accuracy, however, are the sole objects of these *Strictures*: and the author of them feels persuaded that, if he were unintentionally to do injustice to Mr. Palmer, there will not be wanting persons qualified and disposed to detect those errors which he himself will be anxious to see corrected."

" As the disclosure of his *name* could add nothing to his reasoning, and as he is not involved in any *responsibility* for the *facts* which are the basis of the discussion, he perceives no necessity for his coming before the readers of the Repository under a different signature from what he usually assumes, and thus countenancing a departure from the accustomed course of correspondents in monthly publications." Ed.]

" Socinianism—Arianism: terms of reproach which too many are ever ready to apply to such as venture to think for themselves." Palmer.*

Nov. 24, 1813.

Sir,

If my reasoning in a former letter (pp. 715—723) was correct, I have shewn that the arguments of the respectable author of *the Nonconformist's Memorial*, do not invalidate Dr. Lardner's testimony to the Unitarianism of Watts. My present design is to unfold the presumptive evidence supplied by Mr. Palmer himself in favour of that testimony. I have before me his three publications on the subject of his admired writer's orthodoxy: I have read the Notes to Johnson's Life of Watts, the Appendix to that pamphlet and the recent Series of Letters. From these works I shall now collect passages and facts, which, if I mistake not, render it in the highest degree probable that Lardner averred A TRUTH when he asserted that *Dr. Watts's last sentiments were completely Unitarian.*

---

* Appendix to Johnson's Life of Watts, with Notes. Conclusion.

I could enlarge with ease and pleasure on the credit which this positive declaration receives from the character of the witness. Of Dr. Lardner it is admitted by Mr. Palmer (Letters, p. 4.) that he was "one of the most upright of men and most impartial of authors." This acknowledgment fully agrees with part of the *Manuscript Elogium* by the late Mr. Radcliff, who remarks that, "While his extensive learning qualified him to try the merits of every evidence, his unbiassed integrity and sacred veneration for truth enabled him to pass an impartial sentence." In addition to these virtues, he was eminently distinguished by patience and calmness of inquiry. If he has ever been charged with the mutually adverse faults of *temerity* and of *clay-cold caution*, both these accusations, it is plain, cannot be just: nor has either been substantiated; and Michaelis, who severely blames him for not producing certain quotations from the heretics of the first centuries, was *ignorant* that he had drawn up a history of those very heretics.† I am far, Sir, from claiming infallibility for Lardner. But I maintain, that before we are asked to set aside the testimony of such a man, on a grave and important topic, preponderating *testimony* ought to be afforded.

On an analysis of his communications to Mr. Merivale, we find that he speaks of Dr. Watts as being in earlier life a Trinitarian, but for several years before his death an Unitarian, and finally a complete Unitarian. Let us then examine how far this account corresponds with the information that we derive from some other sources concerning Watts's history and writings.

"When he first wrote of the Trinity," says Lardner, "I reckoned he believed three equal divine persons." Accordingly, Mr. Palmer informs us (Notes, &c. 93, &c.), that in the year 1721, Dr. Watts published his Sermons on Various Subjects, in which there is one entitled, *The Scale of Blessedness; or Blessed Saints, Blessed Saviour and Blessed Trinity*, and that, on the review of this discourse in the year 1729, he saw occasion to insert a note which implies his dissatisfaction with some things he had there advanced, and contains the following memorable sentence: "There appears to me good reason to doubt whether there can be three distinct and different principles of consciousness, and three distinct and different wills in the one God, the one infinite Spirit."

Thus far the correctness of Dr. Lardner's representations is unimpeached. It is attempted, however, to controvert the accuracy of his statement, that Watts in the latter part of his life, and *for several years before his death*, was an Unitarian. Now, his deviations from orthodoxy were in fact *earlier* than even Lardner's language imports: and they were wider than Mr. Palmer seems to be aware. In *his Christian doctrine of the Trinity*, printed so early as the year 1722, he discovered his inclination to the *Indwelling Scheme*, on account of which Mr. T. Bradbury, in a letter dated 1725, charged him with making "" the Divinity of Christ to evaporate into a mere attribute," and after jeering at his professed love of truth, writes to him thus: ' It is a pity after you have been more than thirty years a teacher of others, you are yet to learn the first principles of the oracles of God. Was Dr. *Owen's* church to be taught another Jesus? that the Son and Spirit were only two powers in the divine nature?"* Bradbury, as Mr. P. intimates,† was a slave " to human systems:" and the manner in which he treated *the gentle Watts*, was extremely reprehensible. Yet if " the sum"‡ of Watts's sentiments respecting the divinity of Christ and of the Spirit was, " that Christ is a divine person, in consequence of the indwelling of the Father, and that the Holy Spirit is God, as being the power or active energy of the Deity," Bradbury has done them no injustice.

---

† Marsh's Michaelis, &c. 35, 364.

It hence appears, Sir, on the face of Mr. Palmer's pamphlets, that between the years 1721 and 1726, that is *for several years before his death*, Dr. Watts had departed most considerably from the standard of popular belief with regard to the Trinity, had avowed opinions which, so far as they relate to the object of worship and the person of Jesus Christ, are little, if at all, short of proper Unitarianism. I shall next refer you to the state of his mind, upon this question, as I see it disclosed in his correspondence, during the year 1738, with Mr. Martin Tomkins: and here I shall rectify what I conceive to be a mistake of Mr. Palmer's, who, in his zeal to correct an inaccuracy supposed to be exhibited by his " friend Belsham" (Letters, &c. p. 6, note), has subjected himself, I think, to the charge of either forgetfulness or inadvertence.

The author of *the Memoirs of Lindsey* had said of Dr. Watts (216), " His well known volume of Hymns and Spiritual Songs, so much used in Calvinistic congregations, was published when he was very young, and contains many expressions, and many sentiments from which, though regarded by great numbers as the standard of Christian verity, his judgment revolted in maturer years, and which he would gladly have altered if he had been permitted by the proprietors of the copyright, who knew their own interest too well to admit the proposed improvements." In answer, Mr. Palmer allows that " there is some truth in the above passage," but, for the sake of proving " that it is not perfectly correct," he appeals to an extract given, in the *Appendix*, from a MS. of Watts's, in his possession, in the Doctor's *own hand writing*, and adds, " The Doctor expresses his satisfaction in letting things remain as they were." Now, Sir, this extract, which makes part of a reply to a long epistle of Mr. Tomkins, is as follows:

" I freely answer, I wish some things were corrected. But the question with me is this: as I wrote them in sincerity at that time, is it not more for the edification of Christians, and the glory of God to let them stand, than to ruin the usefulness of the whole book, by correcting them now, and perhaps bring further and false suspicions on my present opinions? Besides, I might tell you, that of all the books I have written, that particular copy is not mine. I sold it for a trifle to Mr. Laurence near thirty years ago, and his posterity make money of it to this day, and I can scarce claim a right to make any alteration in the book which would injure the sale of it."

---

* Notes, &c. 91. † Ib. 92.

‡ Appendix, which preserves a curious paper, entitled by Mr. P. *Dr. Watts's Sentiments about the Holy Spirit.*

Mr. Palmer, it is true, Sir, has not failed of informing his readers that the Doctor allows some things in the Hymns, &c. might be mended, but that he could not claim a right to alter the copy which he had sold. Had this gentleman stopped here, I would not have animadverted upon his note. Surely, however, the quotation with which I have just presented you, is much more favourable to Mr. Belsham's conclusion, that Watts would gladly have introduced alterations, if he had been permitted by the proprietors of the copyright, than to Mr. Palmer's, that he expresses his *satisfaction* in letting things remain as they were. To remove the fact beyond all doubt, I shall now produce a conversation between Mr. Grove and Dr. Watts concerning the book of Hymns, which *Mr Palmer himself* (Notes, &c. 28) heard Dr. Amory relate! "It was as follows:"

"Mr. Grove remarked to the Doctor, that several of the Hymns laid the stress of our redemption on the compassion of Christ, rather than on the love of God, and expressed his wish that he would alter them in this respect, and make them more conformable to the scripture doctrine. The Doctor replied, *that he should be glad to do it*, but it was out of his power, for he had parted with the copy, and the bookseller would not suffer any such alteration."

Unquestionably, Mr. Palmer must have lost in 1813, the recollection of what he wrote in 1785.

Nevertheless, though I cannot always adopt his reasoning, I esteem him as a credible witness of what he professes to have seen or heard. For instance, I believe that he has faithfully reported Dr. Amory's statement of the conversation between Grove and Watts: yet, were I inclined to scepticism in this case, how easily might I urge presumptions against it, as plausible and cogent as those insisted on by Mr. Palmer against the testimony of Lardner! Thus, to begin with the very words of this gentleman (Letters, &c. Note, 6, 7), I might argue that "if Dr. Watts had been as greatly dissatisfied with the Hymns, as has been supposed, he might, and indeed he OUGHT, to have left a copy corrected according to his last sentiments." I might ask (Ib. pp. 15, 16), what were the specific subjects of his dissatisfaction? Not only so: I might appeal to his orthodox phraseology in subsequent publications (34, &c.). Or to Mrs. Abney's, the Rev. Thomas Tayler's, and Mr. Joseph Parker's ignorance of the existence of any such copy or conversation! (25, &c.)—Or to Dr. Gibbons's Narrative, Dr. Stennett's Communication, or the epitaph upon Watts's tomb-stone (27, &c.). This, Sir, I repeat, might be done: nor perhaps would there be wanting some who might congratulate me on having made good my cause. But such, assuredly, is not the way of confronting, and still less of overthrowing, direct evidence.

The remainder of the "private correspondence between Tomkins and Dr. Watts" (Appendix, &c.), regards the lawfulness of addressing doxologies to the Holy Spirit: and while it shews that Watts's sentiments concerning the Deity of the Spirit, were, in truth, not more orthodox than those of the persons whom Mr. Palmer would characterize as *Socinians* or *modern Unitarians*, it also proves how fearful the Doctor was of giving offence and creating suspicion and alarm by any wide deviation from received practices and phrases. From the whole of it, and from his conversation with Grove, I infer that he no longer embraced genuine Trinitarianism and the popular tenets respecting the nature and degree of Christ's agency in the work of our salvation; since "he would gladly have altered those of his hymns which lay the stress of our redemption on the compassion of Christ, rather than on the love of God, and expressed his wish to make them more conformable to *the scripture* doctrine."

Assuming a tract published in 1802 to have been written by Dr. Watts, who however was prevailed upon by his friends to suppress the only previous impression, namely fifty copies, which he printed in 1745, I shall request, Sir, the attention of your readers to it, as unfolding some of his opinions at that period. He died in 1748: and with what propriety Mr. Palmer adduces a pamphlet submitted to the world *three years before* as evidence of the *last* sentiments of Watts, I must leave him to explain. In all events, its contents ought to be compared with the subsequent pieces entitled, "Important Questions" and "The Glory of Christ as God-man," but especially with the *Solemn Address, &c.* And I have the same right to avail myself of the fact that the author consented to destroy the edition, which Mr. Palmer has to argue from that work in its present shape. In the extracts which he has made from it I see something of the language but very little of the essence of orthodoxy. Judging from those quotations, I should pronounce it greatly inferior to his other controversial publications. The friends to whom he shewed it, all persuaded him that it would ruin his character in his old age, for publishing such dotage:* they were dissatisfied, no doubt, with its sentiments, or with its criticisms and reasonings—perhaps with both.

In the year 1746 he printed two of the tracts which I have mentioned, namely, *Useful and Important Questions, &c.* and *The Glory of Christ, &c.* These, Sir, appear to be far more elaborate and respectable performances than the pamphlet which was the subject of the last paragraph (Notes, &c. 57—91): together with certain wild speculations on the pre-existence of the human soul of Jesus Christ, and on his visible appearances before his incarnation, and also some unsatisfactory explanations of those texts which represent Christ and the Father as

---

* Letters, &c. 35.

one, we find examples of scriptural criticism that will endure the strictest investigation. It is evident that Watts continued to think much upon these topics: it is evident that he was extremely desirous of reconciling his new opinions, if truth permitted, to a reputation for orthodoxy. But to me it is not less clear that instead of maintaining "the true divinity" (Notes, 54) of the Son and Spirit of God, he had surrendered this article of the established faith. To Christ he attributes, in effect, no other kind of deity than Unitarians conceive to belong to him: and it is remarkable that he describes his pre-existence as that of a *human* soul.* On the worship of Jesus he is profoundly silent; this practice, consistent enough with the creed of genuine Trinitarians, could have no foundation in the scheme of Dr. Watts. The probability, then, Mr. Editor, was that a mind like his would not long retain the metaphysical conceits by which his views of the Christian doctrine were still in some degree obscured, but that, on further reflection, he would separate the fine gold from the iron and the clay.†

It were, in every view, to be wished that the M. SS. on this subject which he entrusted to the discretion of his executors, had been published. The titles of them will not enable us to ascertain the nature of their contents: and a better object than the gratification of curiosity, would have been answered by our being put in possession of all the papers of Watts which related to the Trinitarian controversy. Mr. Neal was perhaps of opinion, with his uncle Lardner, that the publication of them would affect the literary reputation of his departed friend: Dr. Jennings, for reasons which we can only conjecture, seems to have felt little or no interest in giving them to the world; and Doddridge, the third executor, according to a report which has never been overthrown, and of the truth of which, I presume, Mr. Belsham would have particularly favourable opportunities of judging, was anxious that they should see the light. It is observable that, in a letter written to this very excellent and candid man, Feb. 8, 1748, 9 (Appendix), The *Solemn Address to the Great and Ever Blessed God*, is not mentioned, and makes no part of the "complete catalogue" which Neal professes to send him of the M. SS. of Watts: yet this is the very piece which Doddridge is said to have rescued from the flames.

If any of the executors of Dr. Watts were among the friends who persuaded him to destroy the impression of a tract printed in 1745, we may easily conceive, Sir, that they would not judge it necessary to publish certain of his posthumous theological papers. Some little time before his death, a rumour, just or unjust, had gone abroad, of his mind being less vigorous than formerly. There were those who even applied the term *dotage* to the pamphlet of which I have been speaking: and I see that his "growing infirmities" are not unnoticed by Mr. Palmer.‡

---

* See Mr. Palmer's own concession on this head (Letters, 35, 36. Note).

† Dan. ii. 32, 33.

"A gentleman of veracity (Notes, 99, &c.) who had seen the papers to which the *Solemn Address* was prefixed, assured the writer of *Dr. Watts no Socinian* that they appeared to him to contain nothing new, being only a further illustration of his‖ sentiments concerning the Trinity." On the other hand, Lardner, who had met with some of those M. SS., declares, after his perusal of them, that the last sentiments of Dr. W. were completely Unitarian. I am not impeaching the *veracity* of the anonymous informant, when I ask, *Utri creditis, Quirites?* But surely I may be allowed to suspect his *accuracy*, when I contrast the purport and the manner of his evidence with those of the declaration of the author of the *Credibility, &c.*

Of the *Solemn Address* Mr. Palmer remarks (Notes, ib.) "This piece is evidently of the same complexion with what the Doctor had before published, and therefore most undoubtedly that was the case with *the other papers which were suppressed*, to which this was prefixed." The conclusion is too strong and positive for the premises. For the confident superlative *most undoubtedly*, the words *not improbably* should have been employed. But, however this be, I cannot, Sir, agree with Mr. Palmer that the *Solemn Address* "is evidently of the same complexion with what the doctor had before published." On reading it, you will mark the increased scepticism of the writer with relation to the received tenet and his greater solicitude to approve himself a consistent believer in the Divine Unity. It is a document of much importance to my purpose.

This prayer (for such it is) the pious author presents to the One God, even the Father. Concerning any prior state of Jesus Christ he maintains a deep silence: nor does he ascribe to him essential, but only communicated, deity, in which manner he explains those passages in the N. T. that speak of the union of Christ with God. But he acknowledges "his darkness still." He is earnestly yet humbly solicitous to know what share the Son and the Spirit can have in the Divinity of the Father: and he asks, "Is it a vain and sinful curiosity to desire to have this article set in such a light as may not diminish the eternal glory of the unity of the true God, nor of the supremacy of thee the Father of all?" In this investigation, however, it is his wish to follow the evidence furnished by the scriptures, in reading and searching which volume he was conscious of a diligence, regularity and care, for which he appeals to his Ever Present Witness!

One part of the *Address* is singularly affecting. It appears that the doubts and perplexities of this good man in respect of the popular doctrine of the Trinity, had almost ended in his rejection of revelation, from which sad determination, nevertheless, he had been happily preserved:

"Great God, who seest all things, thou hast beheld what busy temptations have been often fluttering about my heart, to call it off from these laborious and difficult enquiries, and to give up thy word and thy gospel as an unintelligible book, and betake myself to the light of nature and reason: but thou hast been pleased by thy divine power to scatter these temptations, &c."

---

‡ Letters, &c. 25.

‖ Watts's.

It is clear from the whole of this most interesting composition that the writer's sentiments upon the matter in question, were far from being absolutely settled: his creed was not altogether fixed; he had not, as is the case of some men, renounced enquiry and closed his understanding against evidence and conviction. We perceive that a regard to the "Supreme Majesty" of God is, as it were, his Polar Star, but that hitherto it is obscured in some little degree by the clouds of early error, and has not yet enabled him to discern and reach the haven of truth. The title of the Address, I conceive, Sir, does not imply that he wrote nothing in the Trinitarian controversy *after* those tracts which he now reviews: and since he *prefixed* it to some pieces on that subject which it was not judged necessary to publish, it were too much to say, or even suppose, that, in his subsequent meditations and M.SS., he made no further advances to Unitarianism, nor arrived at complete Unitarianism. It is beyond dispute that some of those M.SS. were seen by Lardner: and there is nothing in the nature or the assumed date of the *Solemn Address* which renders Lardner's testimony *improbable*—but the contrary. Weighing all the circumstances, I hold it to be most likely that we have no where "Dr. Watts's *last* sentiments in print;" and I also see much reason for believing (though, independently on the express declaration so often quoted, I would not positively pronounce) that those sentiments "were completely Unitarian."

Suppose, Mr. Editor, a man of undoubted judgment, of parts, knowledge and integrity, to affirm that among the posthumous papers (now destroyed) of a friend he had seen that friend's last and genuine will. Imagine, moreover, a testamentary document, apparently of rather a prior date, to be discovered, which, when compared with certain memoranda shewn by the deceased, in his lifetime, to his family and associates, makes it not unlikely that he would modify and limit his bequests in the way stated by the witness. To this testimony what could you oppose? I mean, in fair and just reasoning: for I am aware that in our courts of law, as in physics, the maxim, "*De non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio,*" must be preserved inviolate. Granting the competency of the witness, I take the *probability* of his deposition being correct to admit of formal and scientific proof.

Much therefore as I esteem Mr. Palmer, I cannot but be of opinion that he has by no means considered the subject before him with the attention which it required.—The name of Watts is so deservedly dear to serious men of all persuasions, and especially to the body of Dissenters; the supposed authority too of such a name is so convenient a shelter for some theologians; they can so easily retreat to its protection* and fight under its defence; that it is not unimportant to ascertain, as well as we are able, *the point of fact*.

---

* *Στη δ' αρ' ὑπ' Αιαντος σακεϊ Τελαμώνιαδαο. κ. τ. λ.*

HOM. IL. viii. 267, &c.

So far as Dr. Watts was a follower of Christ (and such he eminently was), may we all, Mr. Editor, be followers of *him!* Whatever I think of his early or of his *last* sentiments, I have so full and lively a persuasion of his superiority as a practical Christian, that my pen would in vain attempt to do it justice. Yet happy would it have been for the peace and comfort even of a Watts, had he embraced from infancy that *unencumbered, unscholastic* creed, "There is *one God* and one mediator between God and men, *the man* Christ Jesus."

I am, Sir, &c. &c.

N.

Mr Rutt, on a Calumny against the late Mr. Wakefield.

(Extracted from the *Morning Chronicle.* Nov. 12, 1813.)

Bromley, Middlesex, Nov. 6, 1813

Sir,

In *The British Review* for October, is an article entitled *Correpondence between Fox and Wakefield*. At p. 220, is the following note:—

"Mr. Wakefield gained not less than 5000l. by his fortunate inclosure in Dorchester Gaol, through the liberal contributions of his friends on the occasion.

> "Merito jam
> "Suspectus, tanquam ipse suas incenderit ædes."

This quotation is from the third Satire of Juvenal, and whoever observes the connection of the passage, will not fail to detect the design of the Reviewer. He evidently intended to disparage Mr. Wakefield's reputation, by attributing those political transactions, which brought his name before the public, to the most unworthy motives. It may be worth noticing that Dryden thus preserves the sense and spirit of the original,

> "Suspected for accomplice to the fire,
> "That burnt his palace, but to build it higher."

Yet the purity of Mr. Wakefield's motives, as to designs of pecuniary advantage, have been often admitted by those who are most opposed to his principles and conduct. To his associates who yet survive, a single word would be superfluous to shew the falsehood of such an imputation. I will rather proceed to expose it, as I am able to do, perhaps, more satisfactorily than any other individual.

I had the honour of first proposing the Subscription, of which, being most kindly and zealously assisted, I undertook the principal management. A considerable sum was procured before Mr. Wakefield had any knowledge of the design. This I communicated to him, understanding that Mr. Fox, in a very friendly but highly delicate manner, had recommended to him the publication of some literary work by subscription, for the benefit of his family. That letter from Mr. Fox is given at p. 69, of the lately published Correspondence.

In the paragraph to which the note in question is annexed, the Reviewer imputes to Mr. Fox "faint expressions of sympathy," with Mr. Wakefield's situation,

---

"Secure behind the Telamonian shield,
The skilful archer wide surveyed the field," &c. Pope.

and a deficiency of " exertions beyond the cold charity of praise." Yet the subscription received from Mr. Fox, which was among the earliest, was liberal, considering his comparatively narrow circumstances, and there is ample evidence that his influence contributed not a little to enlarge the eventual amount.

It may be desirable, perhaps necessary, that a reviewer should be anonymous. Yet surely the writer must, on reflection, be self-condemned, who, thus sheltered himself, should cast his arrows at posthumous reputation, and as his best excuse, could only say, *I am in sport.* This Reviewer, however, professes both morality and religion. He is solicitous to ascertain " the social virtue of a Wakefield, and the Christian belief of a Fox!" I cannot help adding, that an Editor, who admits such a passage as that on which I have animadverted, ought to be more discriminating, or at least, less inconsistent. He should either respect the approved manly maxim, *de mortuis nil nisi verum*, or no longer assume, as the motto of his title-page, *fiat Justitia.*

The representations in this letter, I have considered as duties devolved upon me from my intimacy with Mr. Wakefield during his latter years. I will not deny that I have been eager to perform those duties, from a still lively recollection of our friendship, which was endeared to me by his eminent virtues and rare accomplishments.

I trust, Sir, that you will oblige me by giving publicity to this statement. And remain

Your obedient servant,

J. T. RUTT.

On the Objections to the Doctrine of Necessity.

Paisley, 14*th* 9*th Mo.* 1813.

FRIEND,

In looking over thy last Repository, I was induced to read a paper (pp. 513, 514) entitled " Objections to the Doctrine of Necessity," written by a correspondent whose signature is X; wherein he states that he is fully convinced of the truth of the doctrine, but really shocked at its consequences. There are three objections brought by him against that doctrine, which he considers as unavoidable consequences, but which, in the light I conceive he views them, I will undertake to prove to be no proper consequences of philosophical necessity at all. Without adverting to the introductory part of his letter, I shall proceed to the consideration of the objections. 1st. He says, " Does not the doctrine of necessity, properly understood, refer to the Deity, as to its true cause every event bad as well as good." —I answer, certainly, if he is considered as the cause of all causes and effects; but that the good and the evil are the same with him, in point of intention and design, I by no means think. This I will exemplify: we will suppose then, that neither the properties of, nor the modes of producing, fire, have been known, but that some philosopher has now discovered both: Having nothing in view but the general good of mankind, we will imagine him to be comparing all the good and bad effects that would necessarily result from its coming into general use. Finding the good greatly to preponderate over the evil consequences, he is induced thereby, to divulge the whole, cautiously warning against all its bad effects, while he points out its advantages. Now here is the distinction;—the vast benefits derived from the use of fire, were the only motives that induced him to make it known; the evil results were rather motives of restraint, and finding them to be unavoidable, all that could be done, he did, by pointing out these evil results, so as that they might be avoided. The case, I conceive, to be the same, with the Supreme Being: He foresaw, as an unavoidable consequence that mankind, when brought into existence, in a state of ignorance and destitute of experience, would fall into many errors: for the prevention of as many of these errors as possible, the Author of Nature has adopted the most effectual methods; he has so formed mankind as rapidly to gain knowledge by experience, and gave them in due time rules for the regulation of their conduct, and appointed a state of rewards and punishments. Viewing matters, then, in this light, the crimes of mankind can no more be chargeable on the Supreme Being, as being part of his design; than that all the bad effects resulting from the use of fire, would be justly chargeable on the benevolent philosopher who warned mankind of them. Now when the happiness we here enjoy is far more than the evil we feel, there is no wonder that the Supreme created man; especially when a vast deal of the evil which happens is productive of good. And if we add to this a state of eternal progressive improvement and pleasure, then all evils whatever become as a mere speck in the heavens. To be sure, if thy correspondent conceives, as I suppose he does, that the kind Parent of All, has actually designed that every individual should commit all the crimes he will ever be guilty of, and accordingly has minutely disposed circumstances to effect these ends; and notwithstanding shall condemn his creatures for doing what he designed them to do; if such were a consequence of necessity, it would be a shocking one indeed: it is one, however, that flows not from my ideas of that doctrine, which as strictly maintains as the other does, the connection of cause and effect; the difference between the two cases being this, that according to the one, evil was designed, according to the other it was properly undesigned, being unavoidable. Indeed, I think that evil formed no part of the plan of the Supreme Being, since in many cases it is destructive to happiness and since he has manifested so much care in endeavouring to check moral evil.

2dly. He says "where there is no choice, there can be no accountableness." It is easy to perceive that thy friend here supposes, that a man must be able to do otherwise, circumstances being the same, before he can become an accountable being. But such a supposition is by no means necessary to my notions of accountableness. I have no idea that Jesus, our appointed Judge, will thus address me, "Why didst thou do so and so?" or, "Because thou hast done this, therefore will I punish thee." If I may be allowed to word my conceptions, it would be this—"Thou, by the commission of numerous crimes, hast contracted bad habits, that totally unfit thee for real enjoyment. Now as these habits must be eradicated before thou canst be truly happy, and as I have nothing but thy good in view,—there is a necessity for placing thee in those circumstances (however painful) best adapted for accomplishing this end; so that, when this purpose shall be effected thou shalt be freed from all pain and sorrow, and improvement and pleasure shall attend thee continually." But perhaps this will be considered as walking on the ground of assumption; to obviate this then, I observe, that to punish any one merely because he has committed a crime he could not possibly avoid, appears to me little short of acting on a principle of revenge. If a father chastises his child because and solely on account of his being guilty of falsehood, with the idea that he could have done otherwise, it betrays either ignorance or revenge. But if he should chastise him for no other end than for the sole purpose of eradicating such a propensity, actuated only by the motive of doing his child good, (not of venting his rage) and so choosing the best means for this purpose, he acts not only a rational but beneficial part. In other words, it is acting only from a principle of benevolence, the only motive that properly influences the God of the Universe. That this is the mode of correction with our heavenly Father is evident from this, that whenever a man sincerely repents of his sins (let them be what they will), and is led in consequence to follow a course of virtue, he is sure to obtain pardon. Why so? Simply because that very end is attained, which punishment is intended to produce, viz. the eradicating of every evil habit. This was always the mode with our heavenly Parent, before as well as after the gospel dispensation; see Ezek. xviii. This procedure then, explains, or rather illustrates my ideas of responsibility.

As to his 3d objection about "accounting the moral principles of our nature of no authority, though deep and universal," I would just observe, that we come into the world with no moral principles, they are the result of various circumstances and of experience, and as they differ from each other, some of them must be erroneous. As to the universality or greater prevalence of one more than that of another, that is no proof with me of its truth, more than that the general prevalence of Polytheism would be a proof that there are more Gods than One. That punishment is never inflicted but with the idea, that the offender could have acted otherwise, *cæteris paribus*, I deny; it is not the case with me, and I will venture to say with many others; that it is, however, generally the case I do believe, but that is "of no authority," no weight with me, for it neither proves that it is acting with reason or propriety, nor yet that it is a "shocking consequence" of necessity, or has any thing to do with that doctrine at all. It is just such a principle as I am "fully convinced" is founded on profound ignorance and error.

Should these remarks meet thy approbation, thou art heartily welcome to insert them in thy impartial and beneficial publication.

Thy Friend,

R. H.

A Hand-Bill.

Sir,

The following is a copy of a Bill that has been posted in the West End of the town, which may not appear unworthy of preservation in your valuable Magazine. Its merits speak for themselves, and the general idea on which it is founded exactly meets the sentiments which I have long entertained on the subject of it. If the author should chance to read it thus rescued from oblivion, he would confer a great obligation on me by favouring me with an interview. To attain this object, I know no better contrivance than to refer him through the printer to you, for which purpose I beg leave to trouble you with my address. It is not impossible that I may be able to furnish some aid towards promoting the design in view, in consequence of my connections with several others who have similar inclinations.

I am, &c.

LITURGIUS.

"National Places of Worship at the West End of the Metropolis.

"Thousands and ten thousands of the inhabitants of the above quarter are unable to hallow the Sabbath in the most acceptable mode, that of Public Worship. Is not this a grievous privation to individuals, and a serious public evil? Ought it not, if possible, to be obviated?

"But whence can a fund be provided for the purpose? The voluntary contributions of each religious sect would probably be inadequate to the demand of its own worshippers; and one religious sect must not be compelled and charged to supply public worship for another. This would, indeed, be the grossest injustice.

"Can no place of worship, on the other hand, be constituted, which *all* Protestant Christians of a parish might alike conscientiously enter; and to which all the more opulent might therefore be equitably called upon to contribute? To those, indeed, who recognize the Bible as the exclusive source of their *faith*, what more were necessary than that, in a place, of which the area should be open and gratuitous, the pews around, and galleries above, rented, the pulpit unrestricted to the preacher of any particular sect; the form of worship should be *scriptural* not *sectarian?*

"A Liturgy therefore, from which all unscriptural phraseology should be as scrupulously excluded as possible, fashioned closely upon the model, and after the precepts and example of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ!

"In such a temple, might not every Protestant Christian tender the right hand of fellowship to his brother, and join in devout acclaim to Jehovah and his Christ?"

Book-Worm. No. X.

Nov. 28, 1818.

Sir,

Proceeding to enquire, as proposed, p. 713, with what success the scholar Dr. Gregory attempted to confute the mechanic John Smith, I cannot refrain from applying to the former that sentiment naturally excited by unexpected changes in human affairs, and for which the Mantuan Bard has so often supplied the expression.

Nescia mens hominum fati, sortisque futuræ.

Or according to Pitt,

—Man too haughty in a prosp'rous state
Grows blind and heedless of his future fate.

Dr. Gregory had consigned to the flames the "Designed End of the Socinian Controversy," hardly sparing the author, or rather almost suggesting a writ *de heretico comburendo*, as his reward. Our scholar, no doubt, expected that his own learned volume would

Enlighten climes and mould a future age.

Least of all could he have imagined that, when that volume had accompanied many a mighty *tome* to oblivion, the tract of John Smith, a century after its first appearance, would find an editor in a biblical scholar with whom Dr. G. might not have thought it a disparagement to have been compared. Yet Michael Dodson, to whom I refer, and whom I had the pleasure and advantage of knowing, could have been no competitor with the Doctor in what Jortin calls, the Agonistic style, for he never employed either his tongue or his pen "to bring a railing accusation."

That learned and excellent man discovered, as I have been credibly informed, among some waste paper, the tract of John Smith. Mr. Dodson was then treasurer, and an active member of the Unitarian Society, among whose tracts it was re-published with the following introduction.

"Advertisement to the second edition in 1793.

"It is presumed, that the good sense which abounds in this little tract will recommend it to the attention of the friends of truth and free enquiry, although it is certain, that since the author's time, great improvements have been made in translating and explaining many passages of scripture cited in it. The doctrine of the Trinity, which he opposeth, hath been proved by many learned men, in the present century, to derive its chief support from false readings and false translations of the Bible. M. D."

Mr. Dodson, who was certainly intended by these initials, was aware that John Smith had never referred to the original languages, or examined critically the common version, of the Bible, to which his enquiries appear to have been confined. He no more doubts than his opponent the authenticity of the heavenly witnesses, though he gives as the sense of that forgery (p. 24.), "these three are one, as to the record which they are there said to bear." Dr. G. has quoted that text in seven different places. Thus friendly to the Trinitarian hypothesis was the pious fraud, though as Lardner remarks (W. ix. 172), "fictions when detected and exposed, in the end, weaken the cause for the sake of which they are contrived." Yet Dr. G., not anticipating a Porson or a Griesbach, says of his favourite text (p. 128.), that it does "so gall the Socinians, that they would willingly expunge and blot it quite out of the Canon." Of the miraculous conception, John Smith makes no question, but he is evidently perplexed (p. 25.), and gives some advantage to his opponent (p. 132.) on "the equailty of God and Christ," by adopting the mistranslation of Phil. ii. 6. Dr. G. is also severe upon him for what he says (p. 34.) "Of the coming down of Christ from heaven," accusing him of following "the foolish imagination, and the silly dream of Lælius Socinus," as to the assumption of Christ into heaven before his public ministry. Lælius Socinus, our polite scholar compares to a deluded fanatic of the doctor's own time. This was one "John Mason, who vainly imagined that Christ was come down from heaven." (pp. 197, 8).

To another opinion strenuously maintained by the Polish Reformer, on the worship of Christ, John Smith is no convert. On "the object of divine worship," (p. 43.) he says, that in "numerous and plain places, the scriptures makes God and not Christ to be the alone object of our divine addresses." Thus, though now traduced as a Socinian, he might, in a former age, and another country, have been "a companion in tribulation" of Francis David. That consistent Unitarian suffered, if not under the persecution of Faustus Socinus, yet on his principle of the magistrate's right to restrain and punish heretics. That principle he avowed, like the Reformer of Geneva, while both had forgotten the reproof of their common Master, "ye know not what spirit ye are of."

The tract of John Smith is indeed chiefly valuable, as it proves how the Unitarian doctrine pervades even the common version of the Bible under all the disadvantages of a translation, by a Trinitarian clergy, from a text which the learned orthodox themselves now admit to have been, in many places, incorrect. Yet his learned opponent has very slender claims to the reputation of a biblical student. He generally answers John Smith, not by a critical examination of the passages in question, but by adopting the language of some Greek or Latin father. His opinion indeed appears to have been directly opposed to that of John Hales, who, in his "tract on Schism," *scandalized* Archbishop Laud, by the assertion that "Church Authority is nothing." Dr. G. on the contrary, carries to a singular height his regard for antiquity. At p. 326, he says, without interposing one historic doubt, "there is a tradition that Gregory surnamed Thaumaturgus, received a system of faith by revelation; a creed, embraced, saith Gerard Vossius, both by the Eastern and Western churches." This creed came under the examination of Lardner (W. iii. 49—52), who determines it to be "a fiction of the fourth century, after the rise and heats of the controversy about the Trinity."

John Smith, before he proceeded to prove, "that no other person but the Father of Christ was God most high," had premised, "That there is a God," and "That this God is but one in nature or essence." It is not easy to form a fair objection to this mode of commencing such an enquiry. Dr. G. however, finds fault with it, and thus elegantly explains what he sarcastically calls its "prudence and policy," observing, that "a few truths intermingled amongst many errors, seem like a little sugar sprinkled amongst a greater quantity of ratsbane, which renders the poison the more palatable, and tempts the silly and cheated vermin to swallow it down so much the sooner" (p. 9.)

At p. 13, Dr. G. is again somewhat pleasant. John Smith (p. 6.) had supposed "two such beings as A and B" and added, "if the person of A can do more than the person of B, then the person of B cannot do more than the person of A." His opponent chuses to "suppose by the letter A, our author, and by the letter B, his answerer," and then proceeds, "This inference is manifestly untrue, for this author can make a clock, which is more than his answerer can do; and yet his answerer can make some shift to understand Greek and Latin authors; which, I presume, is somewhat more than our clock-maker can do."

But I shall extend this paper beyond reasonable bounds unless I take for granted, that those of your readers who may entertain the subject, are as well acquainted with the tract of John Smith, as they have been hitherto strangers to the volume of his learned opponent. I shall proceed to collect a few of the more rare ingredients in the composition of the Divine Antidote, designing especially to notice such arguments for the Trinity, as appear not to be relied on, if ever proposed, by modern Trinitarians.

The first of these occurs on John xvii. 3, at page 19, where Dr. G. proceeds to confute John Smith, with the "interpretations of such learned men whose judgments are far to be preferred before that of an illiterate mechanic." He then quotes from St. Austin, with approbation, that "the order in which these words are to be understood is this, that they may know thee and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent, to be the one true God. *Ordo verborum est, ut Te et quem misisti Jesum Christum, cognoscant unum verum Deum.*" Aug. de Trin. L. vi. c. 9. Neither St. Austin nor Dr. Gregory appear to have considered that, like some reputed orthodox among the moderns, they thus robbed the Trinity of a third person, or, according to Calvin's scholastic charge against Servetus, plucked an hypostasis from the Divine Essence. In the train of St. Austin appear Tertullian, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Theophylact. "All these and more come flocking" to astound John Smith with their native Greek and Latin, "words of learned length and thundering sound," though translated for the benefit of the Mechanic and his English readers.

To "prove that the God of Israel was more than one person" Dr. G. adduces (p. 30.) the conduct of Abraham, Gen. xviii. 1, when "three men stood by him," who the Doctor says, "are supposed, and not without reason, to be the three persons in the Godhead, who were then pleased to disguise themselves and appear in the shape of men." That "God the Father might be" one of these men, Dr. G. thus argues: "Because we find him represented under the notion of a man by our blessed Saviour himself, and that more than once; when our Lord said, "A certain man planted a vineyard,' and again, 'a certain man made a great supper,' 'tis sure that by this 'certain man,' our Lord in both these texts meant God his Father." Let no reader exclaim *risum teneatis*, for Dr. G. is quite serious.

John Smith had asked (p. 9.), "how can he be God himself, who truly is no other than the Son of God?" On this subject Dr. G. dilates through ten pages

(58—68) in language not all proper for quotation, yet such as the doctrine of the miraculous conception has too often occasioned. This learned divine, however, (p. 6.) at length satisfies himself, if not his reader, with the following result of his argument. "If a sheep beget a sheep, if a man beget a man, we may easily conceive that since a God begets a Son, he begets such a son as is in all respects like himself; a son who is a God, but though another person, yet not another God."

Dr. G. discovers how *much* he possessed the spirit of an *impartial* inquirer at the opening of his 10th section, (p. 69.) Against "this Socinian scribbler," who "makes bold to tell the world *that Christ is not the true God*," he practises a *ruse de guerre*, once a favourite stratagem among orthodox polemics, and not yet, I fear, entirely exploded, Dr. G. calls out, as if horribly affrighted, *Audis, Jupiter hoc, nec labra moves*? and adds, "'tis infinite patience that our Lord bears with such blasphemers." He then complains, that "councils, fathers, schoolmen, and many other pious and learned divines, must now truckle and submit their judgments to this grand *theologue*, the clockmaker, this mechanic and apron-divine." Against such a simple *theologue*, Dr. G.(p. 86) brings Theophylact to prove that "the power given to Christ," as our Lord acknowledges, Matt. xxviii. 18. "was altogether given him by himself, i. e. by his deity to his manhood." The doctor, afterwards, (p. 87) thus corroborates this opinion. "Since God the Father did, from eternity, communicate to his Son his own entire essence, and with it his omnipotence, we may justly say that when this Son of his was pleased to take upon him the nature of man, and in that nature to work many miracles, the power whereby he wrought them, though originally received from his Father, was then his own; exercised by himself as being man, but received from himself, as being God."

Dr. G. on the hypothesis of two natures in Christ, says, (p. 287) that "our Lord, in respect of his divine nature, is the Son of the first person only: and that person alone, upon that account, is often called the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." But that "our Lord, in regard of his human nature, may not unfitly be called the Son of the whole Trinity; the first person *contriving* his incarnation, the second freely *consenting* to it, and the third *effecting* it." The doctor's Trinity, however, is that of South rather than of Sherlock. At p. 169, he supposes "a triumvirate, three men invested with equal power,—obliged jointly to concur in every act," so that "not one of the three could be spared." Dr. G. "if it be lawful *parvis componere magna*, would say that this case doth somewhat resemble and illustrate that of the three glorious persons in the godhead." He adds, that from the "unity of their nature, there ariseth one will, one operation."

Dr. G. in the latter part of his volume, labours to prove the deity of the Holy Ghost, as a person distinct from the Father. Yet, stating the orthodox notion of satisfaction, p. 262, he says, "this is enough to prove that there are at least *two* persons in the Godhead, the one satisfied, the other satisfying." And, in another place, instead of stating a trinity as indispensable, he admits to John Smith, (p. 172) that "were there but *one* person truly God, an infinite, almighty, and most wise Being, that *one* person so qualified, would be, as this man saith, as sufficient to all the purposes of the Godhead as ten thousand deities." Dr. G. indeed, appears, once, to have been not far from "the simplicity that is in Christ," in the following passage, (p. 144) allowing for a few unscriptural qualifications in italics.

"Our blessed Saviour, *as he was man*, increased in wisdom by degrees, as other men do; yet at a far higher rate, and far greater measures, yet not so as to become omniscient; for the particular day and hour of the last judgment was concealed *from his human soul*, nor was there any need that it should be revealed to him *as man*, because it was no part of that doctrine, wherein he was to instruct the world. It was enough that Christ *as man*, was furnished with so much knowledge, as enabled him to reveal the whole will of God, to instruct his church, to solve all doubts, to confute all errors, and to understand the very hearts and thoughts of men."

Such is the best account of the composition of Dr. Gregory's "Divine Antidote" which I am able to give. Those who wish to pursue the subject further than either inclination or leisure will carry me, may find the volume in the valuable library of Dr. Williams. I am surprised that Mr. Dodson or some other Unitarian, never discovered it, as at p. 245 of the Catalogue the work is thus described.—"Gregory's (Fran.) Antidote against a Devilish Poyson, in answer to John Smith. 1696." I am not aware that I have misrepresented Dr Gregory, and I cannot forbear the remark, that if such was the force of argument wielded by a learned Trinitarian, it is no wonder that the Trinity should soon require to be supported by the argument of force. This was obtained in 1698, under the specious form of an "Act for the more effectual suppressing blasphemy and profaneness." This Act, as is well known, is just repealed by general consent, as it concerned Unitarian Christians: though unbelievers are still denied their rights as citizens, while Christianity is encumbered and discredited by an affected support from the civil magistrate! How superior to *church-statesmen* and *state-churchmen* does Lardner appear on this subject. That enlightened Christian, speaking of Augustine's discussions with some Pagans of his time, adds, (W. ix. 188) "if this freedom of debate had still continued, and been openly allowed and encouraged, and the arguments for Christianity had been proposed with mildness, it would have been honourable to the Christian religion, and its further progress would have been more advanced than by any external force and violence whatever."

I will add here, that Dr. Gregory mentions incidentally, (p. 293) as "a late Socinian book, A Letter to the Reverend Clergy of both the Universities." Of this book I know nothing except the little there mentioned. It appears to have been written against church-authority, and is consistent with its motto, *Non quis sed quid.* Dr. G. had before remarked, (p. 118) "'Tis not very long since a book, entitled the Naked Gospel; was burnt at Oxford; a book wherein its author did seem somewhat to favour the Socinian heresie, and by some expressions obliquely to question our Lord's divinity." For the following information on this subject I am indebted to Wood Athen. Oxon. (ii. 950) under the article of "Arthur Bury, rector of Lincoln College, Oxford," among whose writings he mentions

"The Naked Gospel, discovering 1. What was the gospel which our Lord and Apostles preached. 2. What additions and alterations later years have made to it. 3. What advantages and damages have thereupon ensued. Part 1st of Faith. London, 1690. 4to. said in the title to be written by a true son of the Church of England, and yet in p. 83, he expressly denies the doctrine of the Church of England.—26th July, ejected from his rectory of Lincoln College by Jonathan [Trelawney] Bishop of Exeter. Thereby laying open a way for other miseries to follow on the learned author, certain masters of the universities, like valiant Sancho Panchas, endeavoured to make his fall the greater by subscribing to several petitions, by them drawn up, to be given to the vice-chancellor, for further execution to be done for the author's writing the said book."

Wood then mentions "a convocation, 18th August," which decreed, "that in the said book, called the Naked Gospel, were certain impious and heretical propositions, repugnant to the chief mysteries of faith in the Catholic church, especially in that of England." In consequence of a subsequent decree by the convocation, the book was "publicly burnt in the schools' quadrangle." Dr. Bury had previously published "An Apology for writing the Naked Gospel, of which Wood gives no character, but a correspondent of Atterbury, (Sept. 1, 1690. Epis. Cor. i. 6.) says "it is sufficiently provoking."

Dr. Bury, however, according to Wood, made his peace with the church, and was restored to his rectory, probably as a reward for the following, which Wood gives as his last publications. "The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, placed in its true Light, by an Answer to a late Book, entitled Animadversions upon Dr. Sherlock's Book. Lond. 1694. 4to. The Doctrine of the Incarnation of our Lord asserted and explained."

Dr. Bury might have taken the hint of his title from a publication by Bishop Croft in 1675, (B. Brit. iv. 463) to promote a *comprehension.* That was entitled "The Naked Truth, or the true State of the Primitive Church."

VERMICULUS.

REVIEW.

"Still pleas'd to praise, yet not afraid to blame.—POPE.

ART. I. *A Reply to the Strictures of the Rev. Isaac Milner, D. D.* Dean of Carlisle, &c. By Herbert Marsh, D. D. F. R. S. Margaret Professor of Divinity in Cambridge. Cambridge, printed. Sold by Rivingtons, London: 1813. 8vo. pp. 41. Appendix. pp. 29.

The question really at issue between Dr. Marsh and his opponents, in the controversy relating to the Bible Society, is whether it be consistent with the obligations of the ministers and members of a Protestant established church to join an institution which proposes to itself the exclusive object of circulating the Holy Scriptures? This inquiry, already replied to in the affirmative by the Scottish clergy, some of the disputants have, nevertheless, forgotten, in their attention to those minor points of debate, and, we are sorry to add, altercation into which they have been betrayed. The accusation eminently applies to Dean Milner in his Strictures,&c.: and it holds good in an inferior degree of the Margaret Professor.

—"Nothing," says our author (p. 1.), "would have induced me to write again on that now exhausted subject (the Bible Society), if I had not been compelled by the most extraordinary piece of controversial divinity, which ever issued from the press."

After a sketch of his former antibiblical labours, after a short narrative, in the course of which he tells us that the Prayer Book is "the bulwark of the established church,"* he states it (4) as the avowed object of Dr. Milner's Strictures to depreciate his opponent in the estimation of the public. Then follows, first, a complaint, for aught we know not unreasonable, of the period which the said Doctor selected for laying them before the world, and, next, a censure, which we are sure he richly deserves, for introducing much irrelevant matter into the controversy. With these charges is mixed a poignant sarcasm on the silence of the Lucasian professor from his chair: and we have afterwards a formal accusation against him for advisedly and unnecessarily bringing forward certain passages in the polemical history of his antagonist. Passing "from grave to gay," Dr. Marsh laughs, and raises a laugh, at one chapter of the Strictures, which is entitled The Dean of Carlisle's Infirmities; upon which topic he thus comments (7, 8):

"Now what connexion there can be between his Strictures and his infirmities, or what connexion his infirmities can have with the Bible Society, I am utterly at a loss to comprehend; though I can easily see, that if Dr. Milner, instead of confining the title of *Infirmities* to a single chapter, had made it the title of his *whole book*, it would have perfectly suited the *contents*. But however consistent it may be with the elegant feelings of Dr. Milner, to inform the public of his '*powerful medicines*,'* he should not have forgotten, that he had previously compared himself with *Hercules*, in whose arms his adversary was '*squeezed to death*.'† Now we read of Hercules in the cradle strangling serpents; we read of Hercules and his twelve labours: we read of Hercules at the court of Omphale; but Hercules, *in a course of physic*, is a scene, which neither poet nor painter, before Dr. Milner, had ever attempted to describe."

---

* See also p. 28.

We have taken a survey, thus far, of Dr. Marsh's Introduction. The body of his Reply, is divided into two parts.

Of the eight chapters which compose Part I. we deem it unnecessary to lay an analysis before our readers. The reasoning there employed (and it is eminently close and skilful) Professor Marsh addresses solely to churchmen,—much of it indeed exclusively to Dr. Milner: and it proceeds so little on general principles, and is so remotely connected with any general and important inference, that it has interested us merely as an example of very superior ingenuity and talent. We are of opinion that the author's argument directed against the Dean of Carlisle and Mr. Simeon in the chapter which bears for its title, "Artfulness of the Attempt to get rid of the FACT by the Means of Substitution," is perfectly conclusive. On the other hand, he has not dealt quite fairly, we think, with those of his clerical brethren who support the Bible Society, when he represents them as justifying absolutely and without any qualification the non-distribution of the Prayer Book. All which in equity can be collected from their conduct and their language is, that they regard it as their duty to put forth their *first* efforts for the diffusion of the Sacred Volume. It is evident to common understandings that Bibles will be dispersed more cheaply, and therefore more widely, by an institution which limits itself to this object than by one whose design is less simple, and whose spirit is less comprehensive. A Churchman who patronizes the British and Foreign Society, declares by this act that he considers the scriptures as the fountain of religious truth: but he neither expressly nor implicitly signifies an indifference to the circulation of the Liturgy; any more than the dissenting members of this association, signify an indifference to the circulation of their several hymns and catechisms.

Dr. Marsh having thus finished his general defence of the inquiry into the consequences, &c. proceeds, in the second part of this Reply, to defend it in reference to particular points; and intermixes and subjoins remarks on various subjects connected with it.

He animadverts with a warmth not disproportioned to the occasion upon the Dean of Carlisle's attempt to injure his high literary reputation (66):

> "It seems then," says he, "that my authority must be lessened, in order to invalidate my reasons. And all that I have written is to be ransacked for any possible mistakes, which are to serve as arguments from analogy, that I must be wrong on the subject of the Bible Society. In how amiable a light does Dr. Milner appear, when he thus avows his design to degrade his opponent—and how logical is the conclusion, that an author must be wrong in *one* place, if he is wrong in *another*!"

In every numerous association, some weak and rude and ignorant persons may be found: and we are less astonished than grieved that the Margaret Professor has been assailed with abusive letters from individuals of this description. Surely, his discernment and impartiality will forbid him to identify them with the cause of which they are the advocates: nor need he be apprehensive (69) that he may be required to make some other sacrifice besides the sacrifice of his character.—The Particular Baptists of this country, we are happy to learn (70), have presented him with "a very valuable token of their esteem," for the publication of his History of Scripture Translations, in which justice is rendered to the biblical labours of their missionaries at Serampore. Those missionaries merit no common praise for their zeal, discretion and perseverance: and, observing the direction of their studies in India, Dr. Marsh styles that class of Protestant Dissenters to which they belong, "a very respectable and learned body."

---

* Strictures, p. 279. † Ib. p. 48.

His chapters on Calvinism, furnish some acute remarks in relation to the nature and tendency of the system and the history of the controversy. Speaking of the popular doctrine of predestination, or more correctly of absolute decrees, he affirms (84), "There is no *middle* path. On the subject of predestination we can have no such thing as *half* a Calvinist, or a *moderate* Calvinist." This is a fair and not an unimportant inference. When however we see the ingenious reasonings by which it is endeavoured, on the one side, to shew that the articles of the Church of England are Calvinistic, and, on the other, to vindicate them from this representation, we must suppose that our Professor will not seriously defend clerical subscription as essential for preserving unity of faith!

We copy the following sentences (129, 130), because they describe a memorable incident in Dr. Marsh's public life, and contain information of which, it is probable, some of our readers have not been hitherto in possession:

> "When in 1798 the public opinion on the Continent ran like a torrent against England, and the miseries occasioned by the war in Germany, excited a clamour against us as the reputed authors of it; when the journalists in the pay of France teemed with abuse of England, and they who were attached to us were afraid to defend us, I laid aside Theology to vindicate my country. I stood alone against a host of adversaries, who loaded me with invectives, though with invectives far short of Dr. Milner's. But I persevered; and I changed the public opinion, from *hatred* of England to *praises* of England. In a work, written in the German language, I proved that we were *not* the authors of the war."
>
> —"The Dissenters and Methodists," observes Professor Marsh, when referring to them as members of Auxiliary Bible Societies (137), "are now called annually together in county meetings, where public speeches are made, which are much better calculated to inflame the passions than to inform the judgment."

This language is unhandsome: nor has it the authority of numerous and acknowledged facts. Some of the speeches delivered at these meetings, are perhaps ill calculated "to inform the judgment:" some are examples of a very bad taste in composition; but, with few exceptions, they have no tendency to inflame the angry passions. In general, they breathe the spirit of conciliation and good-will. Many have been remarkably argumentative, eloquent and appropriate; while others, it must be confessed, partake more largely of the style of sermons and homilies than suits the character of a miscellaneous assembly, convened for the transaction of public business.

In one of his notes (138) Dr. Marsh adverts to the conduct of an *Unitarian* Vice-President of a Bible Society in the Western part of Middlesex. Now there is reason to believe that our author has not obtained a correct acquaintance with the circumstances of the case; and we have seen a very different account of it, in a Magazine which the Professor will not suspect of being partial to Unitarians.* The fact seems to have been that the gentleman in question did, in his individual capacity, and in a manner and at seasons perfectly distinct from his exertions as a member and officer of the society, give away tracts in explanation and defence of the Unitarian doctrine. All this he had as much a right to do as the offended clergyman had to distribute Prayer Books, Church Catechisms, &c. Whether any, and what, hand-bills were published by him, we are ignorant. If it be true that some of the style and tenor here represented, were put into circulation, we shall not hesitate to condemn the measure as the expression of "a zeal for God which is not according to knowledge."

We transcribe the Margaret Professor's CONCLUSION (141), upon part of which we shall take the liberty of offering OUR *Strictures:*

"I have now given an answer to every thing important in Dr. Milner's book: and I hope it will be the last time, that I shall have occasion to write about the Bible Society. I have written at present for the purpose of *self-defence;* and I shall be grateful to the public if I have a patient hearing. I have long since abandoned the thought of opposing the Bible Society. When an institution is supported with all the fervour of religious enthusiasm, and is aided by the weight of such powerful *additional* causes, an attempt to *oppose* it, is like attempting to oppose a torrent of burning lava, that issues from Etna or Vesuvius. Even this answer to Dr. Milner, in *my own defence*, is a work of dubious enterprize. I stand opposed, not only to Dr. Milner, and all the *minor* advocates of the Society; I stand opposed to almost every periodical publication, from the Edinburgh Review down to the Christian Observer; to say nothing of the Evangelical Magazine, and the other broods of Methodism, which are hatched at the expiration of every month, and peck by instinct at the Margaret Professor. Dr. Milner indeed has declared that I have nothing further to expect from *him:* and I heartily rejoice to hear it. It is the wisest resolution he can *now* make. A wiser resolution he *might* have made,—if he had resolved not to write at all."

If, when he describes the Bible Society as supported "with all the fervour of religious enthusiasm," Professor Marsh means no more than that its friends are actuated by the strong impulse of religious feeling, they plead guilty to the charge, and would be ashamed of not having their best affections awakened in such a cause. But if he would intimate that they are hurried away by their emotions, without consulting their understandings, they reply that the accusation is neither legitimate nor decorous.

Again, Why should he speak of "a torrent of burning lava, that issues from Etna or Vesuvius?" He will perhaps answer that he borrows this image to illustrate a single point, to characterize the resistless force with which the Bible Society gains upon public approbation. May it not however be apprehended that numbers of his readers will consider him as expressing by this language *his* sense of the *qualities* and *effects* of the institution? This interpretation they will the more readily put upon it, as they view the Society in the light—not of a desolating volcano, whose liquid fires are preceded by terror and followed by famine, but—of a majestic and fertilizing river, that adorns and blesses the countries through which its waters fall.

---

* One of the late numbers of the Gentleman's Magazine. The matter is also noticed in the Mon. Repos. Vol. VIII. p. 350, 351.

It is curious to mark the contempt which Dr. Marsh has for "the Evangelical Magazine, and the other broods of Methodism, which are hatched at the expiration of every month, and peck by instinct at the Margaret Professor." And, truly, for thus "pecking," they would soon be devoured by the object of their attack, did they not flee to a very convenient shelter, where they are safe from the hawk and from other birds of prey. The feeblest advocates of the Bible Society are secure under the defence afforded them by the Protestant principles, and in the use of the weapons with which they are thence supplied. So far as argument is concerned (for invective must be put out of the question), they may triumph here over even the Margaret Professor, who, we repeat, whatever he proves or disproves, has not shewn that any member of a Protestant church violates his duty, or compromises his character, by joining in the most practicable measures for the diffusion of the scriptures.

In the Appendix the scientific and academical readers of the *Reply* will find a very rich treat: Dr. Marsh employs one section of it in defending the principle on which his theorem was founded for determining the identity of manuscripts, against the objections of his antagonist, and in exposing the falsehood of the Dean of Carlisle's principle of computation; in the remaining section he points out Dr. Milner's extraordinary mistake about the meaning of Sir Isaac Newton's *Vera causa*; and his consequent false application of it to the hypothesis on the three first gospels.

"Enough and more than enough" of personality is visible in this pamphlet. Yet we are rather disposed to compliment Dr. Marsh on his forbearance when we consider the provocation he received: and we think that he is very properly and wisely silent respecting not a few passages in the *Strictures*. Perspicuity characterizes him as a writer—acuteness, sagacity, correctness and vigour as a reasoner; and his argumentative style only needs a higher degree of relief to be singularly excellent. At present it has somewhat too dry and mathematical a form; and it admits of being enlivened by well-timed references to other subjects. Even with this defect, it claims our commendation. The mind derives a literary pleasure from powerful works of controversy, independently on the interest of their topics: and there are paragraphs in the Margaret Professor's Reply which must rank among the finest specimens of this kind of composition.

N.

ART. II. *Essays on the Language of Scripture*; with Additions and Corrections. In two Volumes. By John Simpson. Bath, printed. Sold in London by Egerton, and by Johnson and Co. 1812. 8vo. Vol. I. pp. 496. Vol. II. pp. 380.

[Concluded from p. 682.]

The Seventh Essay is "An Explanation of John i. 1—18." Here Mr. Simpson first investigates the true sense of the principal words and phrases, the meaning of which has been disputed; a task that he considers as necessary, in order to ascertain the real signification of this difficult passage of scripture. After giving critical notes on almost every word, he exhibits a new translation and paraphrase of this celebrated *Introduction*, which he next illustrates by parallel passages in Isaiah, and in the discourses and memoirs of Christ, particularly those which are recorded in the gospel written by John.

To shew the view which Mr. S. takes of the Evangelist's *Proem*, we shall copy part of his version and of his paraphrase:

"In the beginning was the word [From the commencement of his public life Jesus was a teacher of righteousness, and a publisher of glad tidings]; and the word was with God [To this preacher the Most High imparted extraordinary wisdom and power, and the privilege of speaking and acting in his name], and the word was a God [As it was on account of similar divine communications, that the Supreme Being himself called Moses a God; that Jewish writers called those men gods, to whom the word of God came; that Christ himself countenanced this meaning of the term; and that Isaiah predicted the Messiah by the names Jehovah and God; so, in the same sense, Jesus was a God]. This "*word*" was in the beginning with God [This teacher was, from the beginning of his ministry[*] aided in a much greater degree than any other prophet by the Divine Spirit, in order to qualify him for his superior office]. All things were formed by him; and without him was not any thing formed that was formed [All that regeneration of mankind which the gospel produced, was effected by his instrumentality: and without this not any reformation was accomplished by it. Comp. 2 Cor. v. 17. Eph. iii, 9] * * * * * And the word was a man, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, a glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of the most favourable truth [This teacher was a human being, as Isaiah liii. 3. xi. 1, 2; and Zechariah vi. 12, foretold he would be; and he was born and lived in Judea; agreeably to their predictions also, we saw and heard glorious displays of his heavenly Father's perfections, in his wonderful miracles, and the most important and reviving truths which God revealed by him]."

Our author supports his translation and exposition with great extent of scriptural knowledge. Many of his remarks are highly ingenious, and many, we think, will stand the test of criticism.

Commenting upon verse the third, he observes, (27),

"The word *γινομαι* occurs about six hundred and eighty times in the New Testament. But I cannot find that it is ever used by the Apostle John, in any of his writings, for proper original creation. Nor can I find that it occurs in this sense throughout the whole New Testament, excepting in two instances, James iii, 9, Heb. iv. 3."[†]

Upon the words *εγενετο ȣδε εν* in the same verse he thus criticises (33):

"This clause is parallel to the preceding. In the Hebrew style it affirms negatively, what had been just before asserted positively, as in ver. 5 and 20. This obviates what might be said respecting the apostles performing the greatest part towards the accomplishment of this reformation. Jesus says to his apostles *χωρις εμȣ ȣ δυνασθε ποιειν ȣδεν*. John xv. 5. and the whole chapter, and chap. xvi. shew that this relates to the kingdom of Christ. Whereas in the Mosaic institution, all the prophets that succeeded Moses acted without any direction from, or power communicated by him."

---

[*] In p. 52, Mr. S. adverts to the opinion that John has here attempted "a *parody* on the sublime description of Wisdom in Prov. viii." He meant an *imitation*; a *parody* being usually, if not invariably, a species of burlesque composition.

Of Isaiah Mr. Simpson says (13):

> "Foretelling the advent of the great representative of Jehovah, who spake and wrought miracles in his name, and uttered the precepts and doctrines which the Most High immediately communicated to him, he calls the Messiah by the names Jehovah, Elohee, and Adonai."

This position of the respectable Essayist's, as it now stands, is destitute, we think, of sufficient proof. There is no evidence of Jesus Christ's being ever called JEHOVAH. The language of the inspired writer, to whom the appeal is made, [Isaiah] will, surely, be best explained by such texts as Luke vii. 16,—"they glorified God, saying that *a great prophet is risen up among us*, and that *God hath visited his people.*" Who would argue from this passage that our Saviour has the name of God? The distinction of the Beings spoken of and the reason of the phraseology, are alike obvious. In the style of scripture, and, in particular, of sacred prophecy, the Deity is represented as himself doing that which he does by his instruments. There is not the least necessity therefore for interpreting of Christ personally the clauses [Isaiah xl. 3], "prepare ye the way of Jehovah, make strait in the desert a highway for our God:" they are descriptive solely of HIM who came to his people Israel by the ministry of the Messiah. And the same reasoning applies to Isaiah lx. 1: *the glory of Jehovah*, is the glory under which he appeared in Christ's character, doctrine and undertaking.

A short but valuable Essay follows (VIII), which has for its title, "A Dissertation on the meaning of the last clause in Hebrews i. 2." Mr. S. considers the proper translation of the words *δι ȣ καὶ τȣς αἰωνας εποιησεν* to be (101), "*by whom also he constituted the age*; namely of the Messiah; eminently distinguished for moral and religious advantages."

This version of the passage is extremely well illustrated,—we are almost disposed to add, incontrovertibly established. J. D. Michaelis* was unreasonably perplexed as to the sense of *τȣς αιωνας*.

The ninth Essay is "On the signification of John viii. 58." To the generally received translations of the sentence *πριν Αβρααμ γενεσϑαι εγω ειμι* this writer objects that they leave it in its original elliptical and obscure state, take *ειμι* in a sense different from its most common acceptation and from the meaning which it bears in this very chapter, and also exhibit the 58th verse in contradiction to the 40th verse, and to other parts of Scripture. He then employs the aid of sound criticism to confirm the exposition usually given of this clause by the Unitarians, to prove that it declares the previous appointment of Jesus to the office of the Messiah, and entirely accords with his proper humanity.

---

* Introd. to N. T. iv, 235. See Grotius, in his Prefatory Remarks on the Epistle to the Hebrews.

We are next presented (x) with "an Interpretation of 1 Cor. x. 3, 4." The following paraphrase will briefly express the substance and purport of Mr. Simpson's remarks upon these verses:

> "1 Cor. x. 1. Brethren, I would remind you, that all our fathers were under the pillar of cloud and fire, and all passed through the Red Sea; Exod. xiv. 28, to 31; xix. 9, 16, 18: ver. 2, and were all thus figuratively baptized into a belief of the divine authority of Moses; ver. 3, and all ate the same food of spiritual instruction; ver. 4, and all drank the same divine wisdom. For they imbibed instruction from Moses, who accompanied them, and who may figuratively be called the rock on which the Jewish Church was built; and the anointed of God; since he was solemnly chosen by the Most High to be the Mediator between himself and the Israelites, through whom he communicated moral and religious directions to them, by whose instrumentality he formed and established the whole Jewish institution; and whom he qualified in an extraordinary manner for his distinguished office, by imparting divine power and wisdom to him in a higher degree than was ever before granted to any other man."

The novelty of this explanation ought not to disgust our readers, or to prevent them from weighing it with care: it is at least unfolded with ability and learning.

In the next Essay (xi) we have "an Exposition of 1 Cor. xv. 29," which Mr. Simpson translates, "Otherwise, what will they gain who are baptized for *a resurrection of* the dead! If the dead rise not at all, why also are they plunged *into calamity* for their *resurrection?* (or, for *a resurrection of* the dead?")

This passage is, after all, obscure. We can admit the propriety of the manner in which the Essayist supplies the elipsis in both questions. But we cannot easily believe that Paul, having employed the word *baptized* in its literal sense, instantly uses the same term in a figurative meaning, and this without any change of subject! He is speaking, all along, of the resurrection of the dead: and we imagine that his aim in repeating his inquiry, is to give it force.

From Luke xxiv. 45, 46, as Mr. S. with truth remarks, "it it has been generally inferred that the resurrection of the Messiah, on the third day after his decease, is predicted in the Old Testament" He conceives, however, that no clear prediction of this fact can there be found; and he obesrves, "The supposition that such a prophecy must be somewhere in the Old Testament, probably originated from its being taken for granted, that *ȣ̔́τω γέγραπται*, in Luke xxiv. 46. refers to the subsequent part of that verse." These words he considers, in his twelfth Essay, as relating to what precedes in ver. 44 and 45. Accordingly, he thus translates and points the passage:

> "Then he opened their mind, that they might understand the Scriptures; and said unto them, that thus it is written. And so it was necessary that the Christ should suffer, and should rise again from the dead the third day."

This is a very happy example of emendatory criticism, in its simplest form.

The succeeding Essay, (xiii.) is "on the meaning of Mark iii. 21. 1 Timothy i. 18. Hebrews xi. 3. Of these texts the first receives from Mr. S. this translation: "And when his own family heard *of it*, they went out to constrain him; for they said he will faint:"

the second he renders, "This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, according to former instructions unto thee, that by them thou mightest war a good warfare;" the last,—"By the word of God we understand that the ages were compacted together by faith, so that the things which are seen were not formed of things which appeared." We can admire the talent and research displayed in this Essay, without feeling ourselves called upon to adopt all the translations, &c. which it proposes.

In the next (xiv), which is of greater length and importance, "The various characters and titles of Jesus Christ" are "explained; and shewn to be all consistent with his proper humanity." It is divided into four chapters; the first of which treats of appellations (figurative and literal) *peculiar* to Jesus Christ; the second, of titles and characters of Jesus *similar* to those which are applied to other men: the third, of names and appellations of Jesus Christ the same as those which are ascribed to other human beings; and the remaining one, of titles and characters applied *only* to *Jesus Christ* and to *the Father.*

Whoever is desirous of doing impartial justice to the Unitarian controversy, should make himself familiarly acquainted with this part of Mr. Simpson's labours. That the illustrations and arguments of the learned writer will leave exactly the same favourable impression on the minds even of most of his readers, it would be extravagant to hope. Nevertheless, they may well lessen the confidence of those who affirm that the phraseology of scripture represents our Lord Jesus Christ as possessing a divine nature and descending from a pre-existent state, in order to substitute himself in the place of sinners, and make satisfaction to the offended Majesty of heaven.

Mr. Simpson renders the phrase *ὁ υιος τȣ ανθρωπȣ. the Son of the Man*, i. e. of David (244—254). It "alludes," he tells us, "not to the depressed or exalted condition of Jesus, but to his lineage and ancestry, as one character of the Messiah." We entertain a doubt whether the article has in this place exactly the force ascribed to it by our author: we are rather inclined to consider *τȣ ανθρωπȣ*, as put, by way of emphasis, for *the human race*, and not for any particular individual. The Essayist's own observation (270) respecting the omission of the article in Matt. xiv. 33 and Rom. i. 4, may shew us that, in the criticism of the New Testament, no very great stress should be laid on either its occurrence or its absence.

We have already animadverted on the opinion that Jesus Christ is described *personally* in Isaiah xl. 3 (285). That Mr. S. should argue to this effect, seems the more wonderful, in consequence of his having excellently pointed out (294) the various ways in which God the Father and Jesus are clearly distinguished from each other as two different beings.

He explains Rev. xxi. 6, and some similar texts, very ingeniously, and thus paraphrases the words, "I am the Alpha and the Omega, &c." "I shew, or reveal, the beginning and the end, or the whole course of events which are foretold in this book." These words he pronounces to be *titles*, not *attributes*. His interpretation, we presume, will recommend itself to the attentive, inquiring reader.

The fifteenth Essay is "on the Signification of *πνεύμα χριϛȣ* in 1 Pet. i. 11."—This he renders, *the inspiration of a prophet*, or *the prophetic inspiration*. Without hastily adopting his translation of the phrase, or decidedly rejecting it, we shall observe that the apostle's language is not necessarily to be understood of Christ's inspiring the Jewish prophets, and that *πνευμα χριϛȣ* may probably mean *the prophetic inspiration which had Christ*, most eminently, *for its object*; the construction and the force of the expression being similar to those of *πιϛιν θεȣ* in Mark xi. 22.*

We are now conducted by the order of these Essays to one (xvi) which is not a little remarkable, "on the signification of the word *παρακλητος* in the New Testament." After citing the four passages where it occurs in our Lord's discourses, Mr. Simpson asks,

> "Do not these declarations naturally present the idea, that Jesus will continue that guidance and instruction to his apostles, after he ascends to the Father, which he imparted to them while they were his associates on earth?" 324.

That guidance and instruction he accordingly continued. In what manner, we learn from John xiv. 26,—"the comforter [guide] *which is* the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." This text is the key to the 18th verse of the chapter, "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come unto you." But nothing, we confess, is more unsatisfactory to us than Mr. Simpson's attempt to shew that Jesus Christ was himself the Paraclete. The excellent author seems here, as in an instance already pointed out, to have forgotten that an intelligent agent may well be said to do whatever is done at his request, or by virtue of powers which he in any way imparts. Against the notion that "Jesus himself was the Paraclete" we take the following passages to be decisive: John xiv. 16, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you *another* comforter [guide];" 26 verse,—"the guide, whom the Father will send *in my name*."

"The peculiarities of the Gospel according to John," are judiciously illustrated in the seventeenth Essay; being considered under the heads of his style, his selection of materials, and such appropriate circumstances relating to the writer as would naturally produce these distinctive traits: an examination follows, of the evidence such coincidences afford of the truth and authenticity of his Gospel.

In the eighteenth, which is the concluding, Essay, we have remarks on the use of a particle in the Hebrew scriptures, and of a corresponding one in the Greek scriptures, which are generally rendered by the word *and* in the English language. It is accurate and instructive, and may serve as a model of that investigation respecting other instances of Hebraic Greek in the New Testament which Mr. Simpson recommends.

On looking back once more

---

* Mon. Rep. Vol. viii. p. 682.

upon these several Essays, we are persuaded that the author will obtain no mean rank among the writers who have exemplified and attempted to extend the advantages of scriptural criticism, in an age and country not particularly distinguished by this study. There are other pursuits which conduct more surely to wealth, popularity and power: and in the established church, and even among that class of Protestant dissenters who breathe the air of Christian liberty, instances are comparatively few of men devoting much of their time and attention to an investigation of the sacred volume. The memory of Mr. Simpson, in every view honourable, will be had in grateful remembrance for the labours which we have been reviewing, and which, alas! he can neither continue nor revise. Such labours bespeak a different and superior exercise of the powers of the mind to what is shewn by the mere lexicographer, and the framer of concordances. We admire in the first place such of Mr. Simpson's Essays as may be styled grammatical, then those on detached passages of scripture, next that on the titles of Jesus Christ, and in the lowest degree the respective Essays on future punishments, the existence of an evil spirit, and the nature of intelligent angels—although we allow to these three last great general merit. If, as we hope, a second edition of these volumes be required, we take the liberty of suggesting this arrangement to the author's representatives.

As the natural effect of the undertaking in which we are now engaged, we have of late employed our thoughts repeatedly upon the interesting subjects that occupy the bulk of the former volume. Nor have we been lightly impressed by the decision with which some other writers express themselves concerning the nature and duration of the future punishment of the wicked. Thus, our correspondent J. S. in pp. 640—644 of the present volume, says, "what this punishment will be the scriptures have explained in such a variety of passages through the whole of the New Testament, that it may be justly questioned, whether there be any truth more clearly or repeatedly declared, or more forcibly inculcated, than that the punishment of the wicked will be loss of life, death, utter perdition, everlasting destruction, the second death. This, when contrasted with immortality and everlasting life, seems as plain and strong as language can possibly make it." But surely this gentleman's confidence in favour of the annihilation-scheme, will be somewhat abated, when we remind him that the believer in eternal *torments* lays as great and, for ought we know, as just a stress on the words *everlasting punishment* in proof of this opinion as J. S. or any other person does in proof of the absolute destruction of impenitent transgressors. We are not here defending one of these tenets, and opposing the other; we are shewing that the controversy is to be determined, if determined at all, by additional and better evidence, and that our correspondent (in whose letter there is much which commands our approbation) should not be so very positive in a case which must be matter of inference rather than of revelation. In regard to the existence of an evil spirit; we suspect that the Satan of the vulgar creed is a very different being from the Satan (whether allegorical or real) of the Bible:—and as to the remaining topic, we perceive that Michaelis* distinguishes between "the biblical" and "the Jewish doctrine of angels." This distinction we take to be well founded: an inquiry into the extent of it, might be not a little advantageous to persons studying the scriptures.

It remains to lay before our readers a few observations on the proper method of classing texts in Essays which have for their object the elucidation of the Bible.

We prefer the *analytical* method of studying the sacred pages. This is the only legitimate and efficient mode of investigating truth. On the other hand, if it be our purpose to teach acknowledged principles, to unfold their evidence, and to illustrate their importance and application, the *synthetic* manner of instruction has superior advantages.

The natural and the fairest way of arranging passages of scripture that we consider as bearing upon points in respect of which the Christian world is not agreed, would be to set them down in the order in which they are found; with references to parallel texts. Such a catalogue being completed, remarks upon the articles of it, with the view of explaining them, would be very admissible and proper. By this means they would be seen in their simple form rather than as composing or supporting a system. Proceeding in this direction, we should avoid numerous divisions and subdivisions, as well as the *apparent* necessity of accommodating our chapters, our sections, and our rules of interpretation to a preconceived hypothesis. The probability, too, of any reader's adopting implicitly a classification prepared for him would thus be lessened. Classification usually supposes that we are masters, in a great degree, of the science where we employ it: yet learners must attend to many individual objects, before they venture upon general conclusions; and upon some of the topics treated of in the above volumes the ablest and best-informed theologians, we presume, must still be *learners.*

While, therefore, we express our humble approbation of Mr. Simpson's diligence, skill and knowledge, while we admire the perspicuity with which he writes, and, most of all, the candour and mildness of his spirit, so worthy of "a disciple whom Jesus loved," we cannot but wish that in *all* his Essays (as in those of them which discuss single texts) he had exhibited specimens of that method of *analysis* which theological *inquiry* demands, and which in *his* hands would have been a mighty instrument of overthrowing error and of upholding and extending the empire of truth.

---

* Introduction to New Testament (1801), Vol. iv. 208.

GENERAL INDEX

OF

NAMES AND SUBJECTS.

A.

A. on the Spiritual Supremacy of Jesus Christ, 98

A. B. on the Quaker Doctrine of the Trinity, 255. C. D.'s remarks on, 306. His remarks on N. C. 307, 644

A BIBLE CHRISTIAN on the plan of a Family Bible, 178, 254, 449

A. B's Elegy to the memory of Governor Duncan, 525

Absolution, Catholic Doctrine of 158

Abu Taleb on the power of the Grand Signior, 634

Academy, the Warrington, historical account of it, 1, 86, 161, 226, 287, 427, 567, 625

Academy, Unitarian, see Unitarian Academy.

Account of a Publication of the Rev. Joseph Milner's, 14

Account of the Pope and Court of Rome, 696

A CONSTANT READER on the Death beds of Unbelievers, 32

N's remarks on, 107

A CONSTANT READER's extracts of Letters from the Rev. B. Davies, 318

Act of Parliament for the Relief of Unitarians, 543, 616

Acts, criticisms on, 116, 127

Acts xx. 28, observations on Mr. Wakefield's translation of, 392, 466, 496, 521. Vindication of the common Greek Text in, 660. Translation of Griesbach's Note on, 663—668

Acts of Grace, Milton on, 28

——— Parliament in force against the Catholic, 150

Addison's Observations on Creation, 13

Addition to the List of Pupils under Mr. Aikin, 253

Additional Contributions to Scriptural Criticism, 456

Address of the Visitor to the Students at the Manchester College, York, 481. From a Tutor to an Annual Meeting of his former Pupils, 517

Address to Protestants, Mr. Butler's, 149—161. Appendix to, 237

Address to the Deity, Dr. Watts's, 533, 718, 773, 774.

Αδω, criticism on the word, 43, 116

Adoration of the Pope at his election, 701

Ælia, controversy on the colony at, 241, 295, 383, 450, 584, 723

Æthiopic Version, remarks on it, 393, 466, 496, 595, 660.

A FRIEND TO CHRISTIAN UNION

on a General Association of Unitarians, 24
A Friend to the Cause of Genuine Christianity on the Decline of Presbyterian Congregations, 371
A Friend to Universal Liberty on Religious Penal Laws, 33
Aikenhead, his condemnation and death under the Scottish Blasphemy Act, 17. R.'s account of his case, 108. R's further account of, 178
Aikin, Dr. his connection with the Warrington Academy, 5. Biography of, 161
A Lay Dissenter on the Necessity of preaching against Political Immoralities, 379
Albania, Hobhouse's travels through, extracts from, 433, 630
A. L. B's. Dialogue on the Scriptures, 103. Mr. Sturch's Remarks on, 297. Vindication of 650, 738. Mr. Sturch's Reply to, 764
Alexander, Emperor, his proceedings on the retreat of the French, 76
Alexandrian Christians, 671
Allegiance, Catholic oath of, 238
Allegory, Marsh's Lecture on, 675
A Lover of Justice on the Prayer of an Unbeliever 186
America, public affairs of, 78, 148, 212, 284, 356, 424. Unitarianism in, 478. Public affairs of, 488, 559, 623, 692
Ammianus Marcellinus on Christianity, 519
A Moderate Calvinist on the Placability of God, 247
Amory, Dr. on Dr. Watts's Hymns, 771
Anatomy, Dr Aikin's Lectures on, 577
An early Christian Church at Rome, 397
Anecdotes of Dr. Priestley, 5. Of a Revivalist, 56. Of the Royal Touch, 94. Of Thomas Aikenhead, 178. Of the Dumb Doctor of Lynn, 235. (*note*) Of a curious baptism, at Dublin, 246. Of the opening of Essex-street Chapel, 388. Of the miraculous cures by St. Milburg, 362. Of the King and Mr Dundas respecting the Catholic claims, 409
Angel, Mr. Simpson's Essay on the word, 680
Anne, Queen, her practice of the Royal Touch, 283
Annihilation of the wicked, remarks on, 605, 643, 797
Anniversary Meeting of the Southern Unitarian Society, 535
Another Daventry Pupil on the Letters of the "Daventry Pupil" and Mr, Belsham, 26. Mr. Belsham's Reply to, 96
Answer to the Dissenting Minister's Complaint 593
Answers of the Foreign Universities respecting the Catholics, 156
Ante-Constantine History of Mosheim 384, 387
Antinomianism, Robert Robinson on, 455
Antiquities at Kirkstead, 81
Απωλεια, criticism on the word, 605
Apparitions, their appearance to the Greeks, 439
A Protestant Dissenter on the Catholic Claims, review of, 411
A Protestant Dissenter on the grievances of a Dissenting Minister, 366. Answer to, 593
A Protestant Layman's Letter to the Rev. Mr. Thorpe, review of, 412
Arabin, the spirit, 439
Arabs, their miserable state, 391
Archangel, Mr. Simpson's Essay on the word, 680
Arminian Magazine, Extract from it, 35
Armistice between the French and Allies, 423, 487, 559, 621
Articles of Faith in which all Christians agree, 159
——— of the Church, Calvinistic, 373
Ashworth, Dr. account of, 562 (*note*). Mr. Palmer's Memoir of, 693
Aspland's, Rev. Mr. correspondence with Mr. Webley, a Misquotation from, 364
——— Vindication of Religious Liberty, review of, 201
Association, General, of Unitarians, remarks on the plan for, 24, 133
——— General, of the Unitarians of Scotland, 536
Associations, Unitarian, 266
Astley, Mr. R. on Mr. Frankland's pupils, 181
A Subscriber, on the Improved Version, 710
Atchison, Rev. John, Obituary of, 277
Athanasian Creed, Simeon's defence of it, 266
——— ——— Dr. Isaac Milner's eulogy of, 611
Athanasian Musician, 327
Athanasius, observations on, 493
Atheist, Mr. Evans's account of one, 32
Athenians, superstition of the modern, 428

Athens, churches in; 438
Athos, Mount, Monks of, 437
Atonement, observations on the word, 722
Attributes of the Deity, their infinity, 11
Audiences of the Pope, mode of conducting, 697
Austria, public affairs of, 487, 559, 621, 691, 749
Austro-Bavarian army defeated by Buonaparte, 750
Auxiliary Bible Societies, on the speeches at 789

B.

B's Extracts from a Religious Correspondence. 181
Bakers, remarks on 689
Bannantine on the royal touch 236
Banqueting house, Charles IId's. practice of the royal touch there 94
Baptism, a curious, in Dublin 245
Barbauld, Mrs. 231
——— Summer Evening's Meditations, extract from 13
Barclay's Apology, extract from, 256
Barham, Lord 299
Barnabas, Epistle of 243, 725
Barnard, Rev. Mr. the tutor of Mr. Lindsey 49
Barrett's Sermon on Christianity in India, review of 268
Bartholomew Day sufferers 686, 706
Bates, Dr. his account of Mr. Baxter 759
Battles in Russia, 75. In Germany, 355. Of Vittoria, 487, 554, 559. Of Dresden, 622. Of Leipsic 749
Bavaria, public affairs of 691
Baxter, Mr. Dr. Bates's account of 759
Bayonne, on the fortress of 692
B. C. on Robert Robinson's letter to the Rev. Mr. Gentleman 704
Bealey, Rev. Mr. account of him, 59. His sermon at the Manchester Quarterly Meeting, 61. His account of his change of opinion respecting Christ 613
——, Memoir of 753—761
——, his Discourses, review of 613
Bel, Mr. on the healing powers of the Kings of Hungary 6
Belfast Monthly Magazine, extract from 313
Belsham, Mr. Strictures on his account of Robert Robinson, 17, 256. On the letters of the "Daventry Pupil," 26. His Reply to "Another Daventry Pupil," 96. His Reply to the Rev. H. Horsley, 172, 240, 294 383, 450, 583, 723. Defence of, in Reply to Dr. Magee 497
———, his Memoirs of Lindsey, Strictures on, 18, 37. Review of 47, 197, 338, 529, 770
——— Sermon on Catholic Claims, review of 409
——— Thanksgiving Sermon, review of 615
Bennett, Mr. his speech at the Unitarian Fund 471
Benson's, Dr. recommendation of Dr. Priestley to the Warrington Academy 4
——— Letter to Mr. Towgood 244
Bereus on Mr. Woolston 177
Berlin, Mendelssohn's proceedings in 222
Berry, Rev. C. his speech at the Leicester meeting 68
Best, Paul, his case 108
B. G.'s account of the opening a place for Unitarian worship at Oldham, 535
Bible, a family, suggested plan of one, 178, 254, 449
——— Dr. Marsh on a revision of it, 675. Mr. Sturch's remarks on the 767
Bible Society, its proceedings, 78, 209 330, 350, 787
BIBLICAL CRITICISM, 37, 116, 188, 392, 456, 521, 595, 660, 675
Bicknell's, Mr. account of the death of Mr. John Coventry, 278
Bidellianus on the Scottish Blasphemy Act, 17. R.'s answer to, 108, 178
Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, 672
BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY, 1, 81, 161, 221, 285, 425, 561, 625, 693, 753
Biography of Dr. Aikin, 161. Of Dr. Caleb Ashworth, 693. Of the Rev. Joseph Bealey, 753 Of Dr. Clayton, 625. Of Dr. Enfield, 428. Of Mr. Holt, 576. Of Moses Mendelssohn, 221 Of the Rev. John Seddon, 289. Of Dr. Taylor, 2. Of the Rev. Hugh Worthington, 561
Birmingham, Mr. Wright's preaching at, 55
Birmingham Unitarian Tract Society, annual meeting 536
Birth of Christ, Mr. Cappe on the miraculous, 37, 188

Bishops, Catholic, of Ireland, their proceedings on the Catholic question, 79

Blackburne, Archdeacon, his admiration of Robinson's "Plea," 19. His Letter to Mr. Lindsey, 23

Blackmore's Sir R. description of an illumination in Heaven, 658

Blackwell, Dr. Thomas, 162

Blasphemy Act, Scottish, account of it, 17, 108, 178

Blood, criticism on the word, 395, 466, 521

Body, on the resurrection of the, 737

Boerhaave's Motto 520

Bogue and Bennett, Messrs. remarks on, 226, 290

Bohemia, proceedings of the allied army in, 749

Bolingbroke, Lord, and Mr. Whitfield, 300

Bolton, Unitarianism at, 58

Books, Milton on, 28

BOOKWORM, No. VI. 357. No. VII. 502. No. VIII. 579. No. IX. 710. No. X. 780

Bossuet's correspondence with Leibnitz, 160. Opinion of an union between the Catholic and Protestant churches, ib

Boston, Unitarianism at, 479

——, Lincolnshire and Cambridgeshire Unitarian Association at, 542

Bourn, Mr. 129

Bradbury, Mr. T. on Dr. Watts, 770

Bradwardine on the Royal Touch, 7

Brazil, public affairs of, 488

Bread, on the assize of, 690

Brief Account of the Rev. H. Taylor, by the Rev. F. Stone, 285. Of the Rev. W. Hopkins, 425

Brighton, Unitarianism at, 535

Bristed, Rev. Mr. 425

Bristol, speech of the Rev. J. Rowe at the No Popery meeting at, 137. Speech of Dr. Estlin intended to have been spoken at, 141. Counter Petition from, 143

British Critic, Rev. H. Horsley's quotation from, 728

British Review, extract from, 776

BRUCE, Dr. on the article on "Irish Unitarians" 515

Brun, F. Le, on the Royal Touch, 7

Buenos Ayres, public affairs of, 488, 691

Bulkley, Rev. C. on revenge, 299

Buonaparte, on his power of touching for the evil, 6. His defeat in Russia, 75. Return to Paris, 76, 147 His proceedings, 284, 355, 423, 487. On Mr. Belsham's illustration of Christ's moral government by the civil government of, 498. His proceedings, 559, 621, 691. Defeat at Leipsic, 749. Proceedings in Paris, 751

Brucker's History of Philosophy, 433

Burdett, Sir Francis, on the action brought against him by the High Bailiff of Westminster, 486

Burgess, Mr. his sermon before James I. 592

Burnet's account of Elizabeth, 309, 731

Burney's History of Music, 464. Extract from, 671

Burns, the poet, his views of religion, 519. On cottagers, 520

Bury, Dr. account of him 786

Butcher, Rev. Ed. his sermon before the Unitarian Fund. 415. Speech, 469

BUTLER's Address to Protestants, 149—161. Appendix, 237

C.

Cadies of Turkey, 634

Calenders of Turkey, 636

CALM INQUIRER's Reply to Dr. Magee, 489

Caloyers of the modern Greeks, 436

Calumny against the late Mr. Wakefield, Mr. Rutt on, 776

Calvin, Milton's remark on, 29. His harsh greeting to Castellio, 113

Calvinism, Dr. Marsh on 789

Camden's account of Elizabeth, 309, 732

Canada, public affairs of, 78, 213, 284, 424, 487, 682

Candidate, remarks on the word, 486

CANTABRIGIENSIS on the difficulties in the doctrine of a resurrection, 448. T. P's remarks on, 734

Canterbury, discussion of the Catholic question in 145

Canterbury, Archbishop of, his speech on the Trinity Bill. 545

Cappe, Mr. on the miraculous birth of Christ, 37, 188

CAPPE, Mrs on Mr. Cappe's opinion of the miraculous birth of Christ 37, 188

Cardinals, college of, described 699

Carluke, Unitarianism at, 538

Carpenter, Dr. on the proper object of religious worship, review of, 413

——'s Brief View of the Grounds of Dissent, review of 206

Carte on the Royal Touch 7, 234

Carthaginian Christians 669

Cases of Thomas Aikenhead and Paul Best 108, 178

Castellio, his version of the Bible, account of 111

Catechism, motive for learning 390
Catechist, Mr Lindsey's 530
Catholic Bill, Belfast Monthly Magazine on 313
——— claims, Mr. Belsham's plea for, 409. A Protestant Dissenter on 411
——— faith, Milton on 28
Catholicism, not widely different from Protestantism 159
Catholic question, proceedings on it 79, 137, 144, 149, 207, 218, 280, 354, 420, 555, 690
Catholics, oath taken by English, 237. Oath taken by Irish 238
——— persecution of, in the reign of Elizabeth 733
Catshole, Mr. Wright's labours at 58
Catterick, Mr. Lindsey's residence at 51
Cazy-askers of Turkey 634
C. D. on the Quaker doctrine of the Trinity 306, 374, 644
Cemeteries of the modern Greeks 436
Ceremonies, Mr. Burgess's comparison of, 592. Of the court of Rome, 697. At the election of the pontiff 701
Challenge from Dr. Priestley to Bishop Horsley 175
Chapel, ancient, of Kirkstead 81, 84
Chapels, on the mode of licensing, 558. At the west end of the town, a hand-bill on 780
Chaplains styled by Milton the yeomen-ushers of devotion 29
Charge of Dr. Taylor to his pupil 89
Charity, Milton's remarks on 29
Charity-school at St. Albans 62
Charles I. his practice of the royal touch, 93. Conference between the ghost of, and Henry VIII. 357
——— on the discovery of his body 362
Charles II. his extensive practice of the royal touch 8, 93—96
Charta Religionum, review of 618
Charter of the East India company, remarks on it 80, 146, 208, 217, 421, 487, 698
Chemistry, lectures on, at the Warrington academy 578
Cheshire, Mr. Wright's missionary tour into, 56. Unitarianism in 132, 249
Chester, Mr. Wright's labours at 56
——— Bishop of, his speech on the Trinity Bill 545
Chiaramonte, Cardinal, his election to the papal dignity 702
Chinese Edict against Christianity 62, 78
Chowbent, Unitarianism at 60
Christian, etymology of the word 98
Christianity, Milner's defence of 14
——— Chinese edict against 62, 78
——— in India, remarks on 208
——— a heathen's view of national 519
Christie, Mr. his speech at the Unitarian Fund 472
Church, a National, unscriptural 29
Church authority, John Hales on 782
Churches of the modern Greeks described 434, 438
Church-service, no scriptural directions for the mode of 42, 126
Cistercian Abbey of Kirkstead 81
Claims of the Catholics stated 409
Clayton, Dr. biography of 625
Clemens Alexandrinus on music in public worship 464
Clergy, Milton's description of ancient and modern 30
——— the modern Greek, described 436, 441
——— English, on the qui tam actions against them 752
Clergymen, Mr. Fordham's remarks on 378
Clockmaker, Dr. Gregory's answer to one 712, 780
Clubs at Warrington 429
Cockey Moor, Mr. Wright's sermon at, 59. Unitarianism at 758
College of Cardinals described 699
Collier's faith 455
Colossians, criticisms on 123
Common Prayer Book the Mass Book done into English 31
Communion, free, Mr. Strephon's letter to Mr. Wright on, 31, 252. Mr. Jennings on, 591. Mr. Wright on 648
Comparisons, remarks on 498
Complaint of the Dissenting Minister, 366. Answer to, 593. M. H. on the 762
Conception, miraculous, Mr. Cappe's reflections on the, 191. Dr. Gregory's ratiocination on 784
Conclave of Cardinals 700
Concordance, Dr. Taylor's 3
Condemnation of Thomas Aikenhead for blasphemy 178
Conference between the ghosts of Henry VIII. and Charles I. 357
Confession of faith, an old Scottish, 254. Of the Quakers, 307, 374, 645. Of Socinus, 646. Of Mr. Sturch 767
Congleton, Unitarianism at 57
Conjectural emendation of John iii. 5. 196

Conscience, Milton's remark on, 31. Royal, ib.
—— Milton on liberty of 115
—— not sufficient for the guide of life, 105 Mr. Sturch on 298, 656, 738, 765
Conscriptions in France 77, 692, 752
Consistory, court of, London, 210, 282, 353. Of cardinals 700
Consolation for the afflicted 659
Constantine poured poison into the church 31
Contributions to biblical criticism 531
Controversialists, hints to 21
Controversy between Bishop Horsley and Dr. Priestley 173, 240, 294, 383, 450, 583, 723
Conventicle, on the word (*note*) 626
Conversation, Dr. Aikin's parties for 169
Conversion of Robert Robinson 259
—— meaning of the term 405
—— of the Jews, J. I. on 590
Convocation of the clergy, remarks on 420
Corinthians, criticisms on 42, 117
Corporation Act 150, 153
CORRESPONDENCE, 80, 148, 560, 624, 692, 752
Cortez, its proceedings, 283, 355, 556, 622
Cosely, Mr. Wright's labour at 55
Cottagers, Burns's observation on 520
Council of Trent, its influence on the pope and court of Rome 699
Counter-petition from Bristol 141
Course of studies adopted by Dr. Aikin, 167. In the Manchester New College, 216. Used by Dr. Priestley 229
Court of Rome described 696
Coventry, Mr. John, obituary of, 278. Mr. Mann on the letter concerning 344
Crabb, Rev. Habakkuk 569
Cranmerites, Te Tace on the application of the term 113
Creation, essay on its infinity, 11. Ascribed to Jesus Christ, spiritual, not material, 500. By Christ, moral, not natural 756
Creed to which all Christians subscribe, 159. Of Gregory Thaumaturgus 782
Creeds, Milton on 31
Crellius on sacred music 119
Cressy's account of St. Milburga 363
Criticism, biblical, see BIBLICAL CRITICISM, Robert Robinson on 257
Criticism, Dr. Marsh's observations on 675
Crito, Dr. Toulmin's answer to 442
Cross, Mr. John, obituary of 619
Crown Prince of Sweden, his proceedings 424, 621, 749
Cures performed by the Royal touch 6, 91, 232, 363

D.

Dalliston, Unitarianism first preached at, by Mr. Wright 55
Dalry, Unitarianism at 538
Daventry, education of Mr. Bealey at 753
Daventry Pupil, on his letter and Mr. Belsham's 26, 96
Davies, Rev. B. extracts from his letters 318
Dean-Row, Mr. Wright's labours at 57
Dean's, Jamie, grace 519
Death of Dr. Aikin 170
Death bed, reflections on a 101
Death-bed repentance, M. H. on 303
Death-beds of unbelievers 32, 107
Debate, parliamentary, on subscription to the articles at the university 197
Decline of Presbyterian congregations 183, 371
Dedication, Castellio's, to Edward the Sixth 112
Defects of the Reformation, Essay on 505
Defence of the common rights of Christians, Dr. Taylor's 3
Deity, infinity of his attributes 11
Delegates of the Catholics, entertainment given to them 421
Denmark, public affairs of 356, 424, 487
Dervishes of Turkey 636
Desertions from the French 622, 750
Designed End to the Socinian Controversy, Dr. Gregory's answer to 711, 780
Devil, Mr. Simpson's Essay on the word 678
Dewhurst, Rev. J. B. additions to his memoir 14
Dialogue on our obligation to study the scriptures, 103. Mr. Sturch on, 297. Vindication of, 650, 738. Mr. Sturch in reply to 764
Difficulties in the doctrine of a resurrection, 448. T. B. on 734
Directors of the East India Company 690

Directory for Nonconformist Churches, review of 268
Discoveries, remarks on 767
Disney family, particulars respecting 84
Disney, Mr. D. his possession of Kirkstead 82
——— Mr. Gervase 84
Disney, Dr. 530. His remarks on the Bishop of Lincoln's charge, review of 616
Dissenters, remarks on 709
Dissenting Minister's complaint, 366. Answer to, 593. M. H. on the 762
Dissenting Ministers of the three denominations, their petition 146, 148
Divine Antidote against a Devilish Poyson, Dr. Gregory's 710, 786
Divinity of Christ, remarks on the term 111, 255, 306, 373, 644
Divinity-students at the Warrington Academy 167
Dobell's vindication of Unitarianism, and Morning Visit, review of them 273
Dob-Lane, Mr. Wright's labours at, 60
Doctors, royal, history of their practice 6, 91, 232
Doddridge, Dr. on Dr. Watts's manuscripts 773
Dodgson, Dr. 50
Dodson, Mr. 531. His discovery of John Smith's Tract 781
Donations of Constantine, their baneful effects on the church 31
Dormancy, remarks on the state of 735
Double Lecture, the Dudley, 418. Oldbury 686
Dresden, march of the allies upon, 621. Battle of, 622, 691. Buonaparte's retreat from 749
Drummond's Letters to a Dissenter, review of 206
Dr. Watts no Socinian, Palmer's review of, 683. His letter concerning, 714. Strictures on 715, 768
Dublin, curious baptism in 246
Dudley Double Lecture 418
Dumb Doctor of Lynn, account of him (*note*) 235
Duncan, Governor, elegy to the memory of 525
Dundas, Mr. see Lord Melville
Dundee, Unitarianism at 538
Dunkley, Mr. his ministry at Kirkstead 82
Dutch assert their independence 750
Dyer, Mr. anecdotes of him 4

E.

E.'s account of the General Baptist Assembly 418
East India Company, remarks on its charter, 80, 146, 208, 217, 275, 280, 421, 487, 690
Eastern Unitarian Book Society, its first annual meeting 541
Eaton, Mr. his speech at the Unitarian Fund 475
Ebionites, remarks on them 492
E. B.'s obituary of the Rev. H. Worthington 545
Edict against Christianity, Chinese 62, 78
Edinburgh, first general association of the Unitarians of Scotland at, 536. Unitarianism at 539
Editor, The, on the history of Lynn, 5. On Milton, 27. On peace, 64, 135. On Butler's address to Protestants, 149. On the decline of Presbyterian congregations, 184. On Aspland's Vindication of Religious Liberty, 201. On Mr. Hopkins, 425. On Unitarianism in America, 478. On the Reply to Dr. Magee, 489. On the memoir of the Rev. Hugh Worthington, 561. Mr. Palmer's note to, 761
On the death of Mr. Palmer 768
Education, remarks on 518, 763
Edward the Confessor, his practice of touching for the evil 6
Edward II. anecdote of his royal bounty 391
Edward III. his extensive practice of the royal touch 7
Edward IV. his practice of the royal touch 8
Edward VI. anecdotes of, 91. Castellio's dedication to 112
Elbe river, proceedings upon it during the war 622, 691, 749
Election of a Pope, remarks on 701
Election bribery 424
Election meeting, remarks on 64, 70
Elections of members of parliament, remarks on 486
Elegy to the memory of Governor Duncan, 525
Elizabeth, Queen, her practice of the royal touch, 92. Sketch of English Protestant Persecution in her reign 308, 731
Elliston, R. Esq. of Kirkstead 83

Ellis, Dr. I. his Knowledge of Divine things from Revelation, not from Reason or Nature 16
Elocution, Mr. Taylor's remarks on 184, 371
Empiricism of the English Sovereigns from Edward the Confessor to George I. 5, 91, 232, 363
Enfield, Dr. his Funeral Sermon on Dr. Aikin, 170
——— biography of 428
——— his Sermon on the Progress of Religious Knowledge 542
England, public affairs of, 78, 144, 207, 280, 350, 420, 484 554, 623, 688, 752
English not considered as Christians by the Greeks and Turks 441
Ephesians, criticisms on 43, 119
Ephrem the Syrian 496
Epigram 285
Epiphanius, on Bishop Horsley's quotation from 584
Episcopus on a Family Bible 449
Epistle, yearly, of the Quakers 684
Epitaph on Dr. Aikin 171
Essay on the Infinity of the Creation, 11. On the Defects of the Reformation, 505. On Protestant Nonconformity 706
Essays on the Language of Scripture, review of Simpson's 600, 677, 792
Essex-street Chapel, account of the opening of it 338
Estlin, Dr. speech intended to have been spoken by him at the Bristol meeting 141
Ethics, Dr. Aikin's course of 167
E. T. his account of the first Annual Meeting of the Eastern Unitarian Book Society 541
Eudo the Norman 81
Eulogy to the memory of Granville Sharp, Esq. 524
Eusebius on church music 671
Eustace's Answer to the Bishop of Lincoln's Charge. review of 527
Eustace's Classical Tour through Italy, extract from 696
Eustathius, account of him 45
Evangelical Magazine, Mr. Platts's complaint of it 454
Evangelical Preaching, Mr. Wright on 588
Evans, Mr. Caleb, obituary of 279
——— Mr. Joseph Jefferies, obituary of 128
——— Rev. John, remarks on his Sermon upon the death of Mr. Lowdell 32
Evanson, his Dissonance, remarks on 397, 400, 458
Evans's Letter on the Dissenting Minister's Petition, review of 342
Evil, king's, Richards's History of the Royal Touch for 5, 91, 232, 363
Examination of Robinson's Plea, &c. account of it 20, 256, 532
Examinations, annual, at the Manchester New College, 216. Annual, at the Manchester College, York 480
Excommunication, English case of 209, 282, 353. On the Methodist at Flushing 34, 301
Exercises of the Students at the Warrington Academy 169
Exeter, No Popery proceedings at 218, 275
Existence, remarks on 736
Extract from an old Scottish Confession of Faith 254
EXTRACTS FROM NEW PUBLICATIONS 5, 91, 232, 433, 630, 696.
Extracts from a Religious Correspondence 181
——— of Letters from the late Rev. B. Davies 318
Exposition of the Proem of the gospel of John 792

F.

Falkirk, Unitarianism at 538
Family Bible, a Bible Christian on the plan of, 178, 254. Episcopus on 449
Fast Day of Feb. 24, 63
Fathers, the, Milton on 114
Feasts of the Modern Greeks 434
Feathers' Tavern Association 197
Felton, John, anecdotes of 733
Female Society, Milton on 114
Ferns, Bishop of, Dr. Robertson's letter to 447
Fides Carbonaria 455
Filius Polonorum, his inquiry concerning Socinian Tracts, 14. Dr. Toulmin's answer to 443
Finance, remarks on 422
Fire, the doctrine of necessity exemplified by the discovery of 777
Firmin, Thomas, Wesley's account of him 35
Fishers of men 391

Fletcher, Rev. I. his account of the Unitarians 36
Flower's, Mr. Strictures on Mr. Belsham's account of Robert Robinson, 17, 256
Flushing, on the Methodist excommunication at 34, 301
Foe, Daniel De, an Universalist 657
Fordham, Mr. on the Clerical Character 377
Forerunner of Professor Marsh 327
Form of prayer drawn up by Henry VII. for the Royal Touch, 9. (*Note.*) 92
Form of Prayer, Milton on 114
Forster, Mr. Reinhold, his connection with the Warrington Academy 288
Foster, Thomas, on his expulsion by the Quakers 306
Fox, Mr. his correspondence with Mr. Wakefield 779
Fox. W J. his Discourse on the Tendency of Unitarianism and Calvinism, review of 618
France, public affairs of, 76, 147, 212, 284, 424, 486, 559, 691, 749, 752. Invasion of, 692
Frankland, Mr. Mr. Astley on his pupils 181
Franks, the Greeks' description of them 440
French, on their military tactics 622, 749
—— sovereigns, their practice of the Royal Touch 6
Frend, W. Esq. his speeches at the Unitarian Fund meeting, 468. Dr. Milner's machinations against 612
Friends, their doctrine of the Trinity 109, 255, 306, 373, 644
Fuller, his Good Thoughts for Worse Times 455
Functions, civil and ecclesiastical, Milton on, 114
Fund, Unitarian, see Unitarian Fund.
Funerals of the modern Greeks, 435, Similar to the Irish ib.
Funeral Sermon for Mr. Worthington 573
Future State of Infants 245

G.

Gaius on a new edition of Dr. Priestley's Works 317
Gandolphy, his Letter to Dr. Marsh, review of 204
Gandolphy, his Second Letter to Dr. Marsh, review of 329
Gas lights, on lighting London with 690
General Association of the Unitarians of Scotland 536
General Baptists' Assembly 418
Gentleman, Rev. Mr. Robert Robinson's letter to 704
Genuineness of the Epistle to the Romans, on the 193, 397, 399
German war, Dr. Marsh on 789
Germany, public affairs of 148, 212, 284, 355, 423, 487, 559, 621, 691, 749
Ghosts of Henry VIII. and Charles I. conference between 357
G. H. his account of the General Association of the Unitarians of Scotland 536
Gibbon, his Account of Christianity considered, &c. by Mr. Milner 14
Gibbons Dr. on Dr. Watts's last religious opinions 722
Gibbs, Mr. Silvanus, his obituary of the Rev. J. Jones, 551. Mr. Maurice on 639
Gilbert, Mr. of Northampton 26
Gilchrist, Rev. Mr. his speech at the Unitarian Fund 477
Gilpin's Life of Cranmer 509
Gimelli on the royal touch 237
Γινομαι, scriptural meaning of the word 756, 792
Gins, the Turkish ghosts 439
Girle, Rev. S. obituary of 280
Glasgow, Unitarianism at 538
——— Unitarian Fund 489
GLEANINGS, Prince of Wales spiritualized, 327. A Forerunner of Professor Marsh, *ib.* Athanasian Musician, *ib.* Popular Preaching, 328. Ruin of Monarchs, *ib.* No time in the Grave, *ib.* Pope Innocent XI, 390. Quakers. *ib.* Motive for learning the Catechism, *ib.* Miserable state of the Arabs, 391. Fishers of men, *ib.* Royal Bounty, *ib* "Much Good do you," 455. *Fides Carbonaria*, *ib.* Antinomianism, *ib.* Head of a Faction, *ib.* A Heathen's View of National Christianity, 519. Boerhaave's Motto 520. Cottagers, *ib.* Victims of Persecution, *ib.* Reform, *ib.* Daniel De Foe an Universalist, 657. Mahometan Calvinism, 658.

A Mourning Mother, *ib.* Illuminations in Heaven, *ib.* Sentiment from Mirabeau, 659. W. Penn, *ib.* Consolation for the Afflicted, *ib.*
G. L. his obituary of the Rev. W. Severn 550
Goa, abolition of the Inquisition at 559
God, on the infinity of all the attributes of, 11. On the placability of 247
Godfather, a Mahometan 245
Goldie, John, of Kilmarnock, inquiry concerning 24
Goodbehere, Alderman, his speech at the Unitarian Fund 472
Gospel Recovered, John Goldie's account of it 24
Grand Signior, on his power 634
Granville, Lord, his opinions 638
Grattan, Mr. 317
Greeks, modern state of religion amongst 483
Greenock, Unitarianism at 538
Gregorian style, 561. (*note.*)
Gregory, Dr. account of, 710. His answer to John Smith 711, 780
——— Thaumaturgus, creed of 782
Griesbach, Mr. Jones's remarks on 466. Dr. Lloyd's remarks on, 522, 595. Translation of his Note on Acts xx. 28 663
Grievances of the Roman Catholics 149, 237
Grosvenor, Dr. B. his library 86
Grotta Ferrata, Greeks of 437
Grove, Mr. on Dr. Watts's Hymns 770
GRUNDY, Rev. J. on Unitarianism in America 478
——— Poetical Epistle to 618
Guadaloupe, cession of 424
Guide, Scripture the only, 106, 299 650, 738

H.

H's. obituary of Mr. E. Worthington 357
Hackney College, on the remaining Funds of 180
Hale, Unitarianism at 57
Hales, Mr. J. on a motive for learning the Catechism 390
Hall, Rev. R. account of him 263
Hamburgh, proceedings in during the war 356, 424, 487
Hamilton, Unitarianism at 538
Hampson, his Poetical Epistle to the Rev J. Grundy, review of 618
Hanau, battle of 750
Hand Bill, on places of worship at the West End of the Town 780
Handmills, observations on 629
Hanley, Mr. Wright's labours at 56
Happiness of a people, Milton on 115
——— of a future State, Simpson's Essay on 606
Happy Puritan Quotation 592
Hapsburg, House of, endowed with the power of the Royal Touch 6
Harlow Resolutions and Petition 217
Hastings, Lady Ann 50
Hawkins, Sir John, his account of Mr. Dyer 4
Haynes, Mr. Hopton 515
Head of a Faction 455
Heapfold, Mr. Wright's lecture at 58
Heart, scriptural use of the word 121
Heathen's View of National Christianity 519
Heathens, their corruptions of Christianity 193
Heaven, Illuminations in, 658. Mr. Simpson's Essay on the word 680
Hebrew, Dr. Taylor's mode of teaching 87
——— remarks on 426
——— Concordance, Dr. Taylor's 3
Hebrews, criticisms on 123
Henry II. his practice of the Royal Touch 7
Henry III. his practice of the Royal Touch 7
Henry VII. his improvement in the practice of the Royal Touch 8
Henry VIII. his practice of the Royal Touch for the King's evil, 10. His effectual cure of the Pope's evil, 11. Anecdotes of 140. Conference between the Ghost of, and Charles I. 357
Hercules in a course of physic 788
Heretics converted by Henry VII. 10
——— Milton on, 115 Catholics deny the doctrine of persecuting, 157
Heroine, reflections of one, on a death bed 101
Hesychius, account of him 45
Hextal, Mr. 27
Heylyn, Dr. on the Royal Touch 93
Heywood, Arthur, Esq. 2
Hierarchy, remarks on 100
High Commission court 311
Hindoos, on their conversion, 422. Their moral character *ib.*
Hirons, Rev. Jabez, obituary of 52
Historical Account of the Warrington Academy, 1, 86, 161, 226, 287, 427, 576, 625
HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY, 1, 81, 161, 221, 285, 425, 561, 625, 693, 753

Hobhouse's Albania, extract from, 433, 630
Hogias of Turkey 635
Holden, Mr. his report of the Kent and Sussex Unitarian Christian Association 419
Holland, declaration of its independence, 750. Parties in 751
Holland, Rev. Philip, his account of Mr. Seddon 291
——— his sermons 251
Holt, Mr. his connection with the Warrington Academy 4, 86, 281. Biography of 576
Holy Spirit, Mr. Cappe's remarks on the scripture meaning of the term 38, 192. Dr. Watts on 772
Hopkins, Rev. W. Mr. Stone's brief account of 425
Horsley, Bishop, his controversy with Dr. Priestley 173, 240, 294. 383, 450, 583, 723
Horsley, Rev. H. Mr. Belsham's Reply to 172, 240, 294, 383, 450, 583, 723
Horsley's Sermons, review of 332
Howard the Philanthropist, anecdote of 754
Hughes, his Sermon on the Titles and Attributes of God, review of 273
Hume and Mrs. Hannah More 107
——— his death bed 33, 107
Humility, J. C. on 589
Hungary, Kings of, their wonderful powers of healing 6
Huntingdon, Lady, anecdotes of her 48
————— W. original letter from, to the Rev. Mr. Parsons 705
Hyde, Mr Wright's preaching at 57
Hymn, criticism on the word 43. An Universal Unitarian 183. Sung after the Funeral Sermon for Mr. Bealey 760
Hymns of Dr. Watts, remarks on 770

I.

Idiotæ, Bishop Horsley's rendering of the word 243
Ignotus on the Future State of Infants 245
Illuminations in London, disgraceful conduct of the populace at 486. Of the Turkish Mosques at Ramazan 635. In Heaven 658
Illustrations of Scripture, 196, (See Biblical Criticism.)
Images of the modern Greeks 439
Imaums of Turkey 634
Immoralities, political, on the necessity of preaching against 379
Important Questions, Watts's 772
Improved Version of the New Testament, remarks on 459. Defence of it in reply to Dr. Magee 490. A Subscriber on 710
India Company, see East India Company
Individuality in a future state, reremarks on 736
Indwelling scheme, remarks on 769
Infallibility, Dr. Marsh on the claim to 676
Infanticide, remarks on 343
Infants, on the future state of 245
Infirmities of the Dean of Carlisle, Marsh's observations on 787
Informer against the clergy, remarks on 752
Innocent XI. Pope 390
Inquisition in Spain, discussion on it 148, 283, 354, 555, 623
INTELLIGENCE 55, 131, 214, 274, 348, 414, 468, 535, 684, 744
Intercession, criticism on the word 497
Interpretation of scripture, Mr. Cappe's remarks on 40, 192
I. P. on Unitarian Associations 246
Ireland, proceedings on the Catholic question in 79, 421, 555, 690
Irish Funerals 435. Similar to the modern Greeks 436
Irish Unitarians, Dr. Bruce on the article 515
Irish Protestants, their liberality 33
Irregularity, Milton on 115
Islamism, see Mahometanism
Israel, Moses Mendelssohn's connection with 222
Istamboul Effendi of Turkey 634
Italy, public affairs of 78
Ivimey, Mr. his conduct to the Dissenting ministers 342
I. W. his Memoir relating to Kirkstead 81. His account of a curious baptism 245

J.

Jacobi, his controversy with Mendelssohn 225
Jacomb, Mr. 566
James, Epistle of, criticisms on 123
James I. his practice of the royal touch 92
James II. his practice of the royal touch 232
J. C. on Humility 589
Jebb, Dr. 531
Jennings, Dr. his Funeral Sermon on Dr. Watts 722
Jennings, Mr. on Mr. Wright's Letter on Free Communion 591. Mr. Wright's answer to 648

Jerome, Bishop Horsley's quotation from 450, 587
Jervis, Mr. his intended Speech on the Catholic Question 616
Jesus Christ, Cappe on the miraculous birth of 37, 188. His spiritual supremacy, 98. Spiritual creation ascribed to, and not material 500. On the resurrection of the body of 737. Creation by, moral not natural 756. Dr. Watts on 773. Dr. Gregory on the conception of 784. On the power given to ib.
Jews, a knowledge of their opinions and habits necessary to the interpretation of scripture 41. On their use of music 124. Mr. Cappe's remarks on them 188. Remarks on 226. Society for their conversion 283. J. I. on their conversion 590. Society for the conversion of 644
J. F. his account of the Anniversary Meeting of the Southern Unitarian Society 535
J. H. on a passage in Mr. Wright's Journal 249. Mr. Wright's reply to 588
J. H. B. his report of the Dudley Double Lecture 418. Account of the meeting of the Warwickshire Unitarian Tract Society 536
J. I. on the conversion of the Jews 590
J. I's criticism on Acts iv. 8. 128
Johns, Mr. his reply to Mr. Riles 301
Johnson's Life of Watts 769
Johns's Importance of the Scriptures review of 617
Jones, Jeremiah, on the Epistle of Barnabas 728
JONES, Mr. John, on Wakefield's translation of Acts xx. 28, 466. Dr. Lloyd's answer to 521, 595 His vindication of the common Greek Text in Acts xx. 28, 660
Jones, Rev. J. obituary of 551. Mr. Maurice on 639
Journal of Mr. Wright, on an error in it, 249. J. H. on a passage in 588
Joyce, Rev. J. J. his speech at the Unitarian Fund, 469. His Memoir of the Rev. Hugh Worthington 561
J. P. his account of the Lincolnshire and Cambridgeshire Unitarian Association 542
J. S. on Future Punishment 640 Remarks on 797
J. T. C. his conjectural emendation of John iii 5 196
J. T. E. his criticism on Phil. ii. 5--9 195
Justification, Dr. Taylor's theory of a two-fold sense of the word 3
Justin Martyr, account of, 462. Account of the Christians in his time ib.

K.

Kay, Mr. Mr. Wright's error respecting, 249
Keith, George, account of, (*note.*) 646
Kendal, Mr. Wright's labours at 61, 249
Kent, discussion of the Catholic Question in 145
Kent and Sussex Unitarian Christian Association, 419 Its Resolutions on the Trinity Bill 747
Kibworth, Dr. Aikin's school at 164. His pupils at 253
Kilmarnock, John Goldie of 24
Kilwinning, Unitarianism at 538
King, Mr. his conduct towards Mr. Jones 639
King's evil, Richards's History of the Royal Touch for 5, 91, 232, 363
Kingsley, state of Unitarianism at 56
King's Primitive Church 670
Kioprili Mustapha Pasha, his answer to a Seyeh, (*note.*) 637
Kippis, Dr. his account of Lord Granville 638
Kirk of Scotland, remarks on it 490
Kirkby Lonsdale, Mr. Wright's labours at 61
Kirkby Whiske, rectory of 50
Kircaldy, Unitarianism at 538
Kirkstead, Lincolnshire, 3. Memoir relating to 81
Knight, Dr. on the Articles 378
Knighton on John Wickliff 327
Knutsford, Unitarianism at 56
Koinonos on a General Association of Unitarians, remarks on 24
Koran, remarks on it, 632. Extract from, (*note.*) 633
Kremlin of Moscow, Buonaparte's possession of it 76
Κυριος, criticism on the word, 393, 466, 522, 596, 670

L.

Labourers in the vineyard, criticism on the parable of 458
Laity, remarks on the term 420. And clergy, not distinct in Turkey 635
Lanark, Unitarianism at 538
Lancashire, state of the county in 1758, (*note.*) 5

Lancashire, Mr. Wright's missionary tour into, 57. Unitarianism in 133, 249
Language of scripture, Mr. Cappe's remarks on, 39, 188. Simpson's Essays on 600, 677, 792
Lardner, Dr. anecdotes of 328. On the gospel of Luke 495. On Ammianus Marcellinus's view of Christianity, 519. On Dr. Watts's last religious opinions 534, 683. On his testimony to Dr. Watts's last religious opinions 715, 769
Lavater, his dedication to Mendelssohn 224
Law, Dr. on criticism 257
Law, the Divine, Milton on 115
Laws, religious penal 33. Penal against the Roman Catholics 150, 232
L. C. on the use of vocal and instrumental music in public worship 41, 116, 460, 668
L. C's obituary of Mr. John Cross 619
Lectures, Dr. Taylor's, at the Warrington Academy 87. Dr. Aikin's, 166. Dr. Priestley's 228. To the young, remarks on, 568. (*note.*) Mr. Bealey's 757
Lee, J. Esq. his account of a debate in parliament 197
Legislator, Christ the only spiritual 99
Leibnitz, his correspondence with Bossuet 160
——— on Mahometanism 631
Leicester, proceedings at, for petitioning for peace 64
Leipsic, battle of 749
L'Enfant, M. 583
Lenthall, Sir John 503
Lessing, his acquaintance with Mendelssohn 223, 225
Letter to Mr. W. Cobbett, review of 619
Letter from the Unitarians of Plymouth to Mr. W. Smith 685
Liberty of Conscience and of Person, Milton on 115. Religious, review of Aspland's Vindication of 201. Of conscience, remarks on the phrase 731
Library of the Warrington Academy 86
Licences for chapels, remarks on 558
Life of Moses Mendelssohn, 221. See Biography
Lincolnshire and Cambridgeshire Unitarian Association 542
Lindsay, his Sermon on the Influence of Relgious Knowledge, review of 412
Lindsey, Belsham's Memoirs of, Strictures on, 18, 37. Review of 47, 197, 338, 529
Lindsey, Mr. Archdeacon Blackburne's Letter to 23
Lindsey, Mrs, 50
List of the Prisoners in the Upper Bench, &c. in 1653, 502
LITTLE, Mr. his extract from an old Scottish Confession of Faith 254
Liturgies, slight difference between the Romish and English 10 (*note*)
LITURGIUS on a Hand Bill respecting places of worship at the West End of the Town 780
Liturgy, Simeon on the 266. The Liverpool 626
———, plan of a scriptural 780
Liverpool, Unitarianism at 57
Liverpool, Earl of, on the Catholic Question 161
Liverpool Liturgy, account of it 626
Livy, remarks on 492
LLOYD, Dr. his answer to Mr. Jones, 521, 595. Translation of Griesbach's Note on Acts xx. 28, 663—668
Loan of twenty-seven millions, remarks on it 422
Locke, John, Milner's remarks on his theological writings 15. On his religious opinions 516
London, discussion of the Catholic Question in 145
Lord, Rev. W. obituary of 347
Lord's supper, on free communion at the 31, 252, 591, 648
Love, translation of Schiller on 526
Lovel, Christopher, touched for the evil by the Pretender 233
Lowdell, Mr. S remarks on Mr. Evans's Funeral Sermon for 32
Lowth on Christianity 203
Lucian on the Christians 464
Luddites, proceedings of government towards them 80
Luke, on the disputed chapters of 492
Lutzen, battle of 356
Lynn, Henry VIIth's practice of the royal touch at 10. Account of the Dumb Doctor of, 235, (*note.*)

M.

Macaulay on Queen Elizabeth 732
Madge, Mr. quere to 710
Madge's Sermon on the free grace of God, review of 343
Madrid, on the formation of an Auxiliary Bible Society at 623
Magee, Dr. Reply to 489
Mahomet, observations on 632
Mahometan Calvinism 658

Mahometanism, present state of, in Turkey 630
Maimonides, Mendelssohn's study of 221
Maltby, Dr. on the Bible Society 330
Manchester, Unitarianism at 59, 132
Manchester College, York, report of 215. Annual examination of the students at 480
Manchester Quarterly Meeting 61, 275, 686
MANNING, Mr. on Dr. Benson's letter to Mr. Towgood 244
Manning's Sermons, review of 404
MANN, Rev. Mr 278. On the letter concerning Mr. J. Coventry 344
Manuscripts of Dr. Watts, remarks on them 716, 720, 769, 773
Marat, his connection with the Warrington Academy, 578. Biographical anecdotes of (*note*) ib.
Marcion, account of 493
Markham, Dr. 200
Marsh, Professor, on the Bible Society 329
——— Milner's Reply to 609, 690
Marsh's Lectures, Part III. review of 673
——— Letter to Gandolphy, review of 205
——— Reply to the Rev. Isaac Milner, review of 787
Mary, Queen, her practice of the royal touch 93
Mathematicians, European, at Pekin 63
Matthew, on the disputed chapters of 492
Maty's Review, extract from 24
MAURICE, Rev. Mr. Mr. Gibbs's account of, 554. On a passage in the obituary of Mr. Jones 639
Medecis, Mary de 358
Melville Lord, his conference with royalty respecting the Catholics 410
Memoir relating to Kirkstead 81
——— of the Rev. Hugh Worthington, 561 Of Dr Caleb Ashworth, 693 Of the Rev. Joseph Bealey, 753—see Biography.
Mendelssohn, Moses, sketch of the life, writings, and character of 221
Mercurius Politicus, extract from it respecting the royal touch 94
Mercurius Publicus for 1661, extracts from it 94
Meredith, Sir William 197
Merivale, Rev. Mr. his letter concerning Dr. Watts, 533, 714, 717, 769
Merrick's version of the 59th Psalm 638
Messenger from the dead, extract from 357, 502
Methodist excommunication at Flushing 34, 301
Mexico, public affairs of 78, 284, 488, 559
M. H. on the reflections on a death-bed 101
——— on death-bed repentance 303
——— on monuments in dissenting places of worship 365
——— on the Society for the conversion of the Jews, 644. On the Dissenting Minister's complaint 762
Michaelis on the Æthiopic version 595
Middleton, Dr. on the Æthiopic version ib.
Milky Way, immense number of stars in 13
Millers, remarks on 689
Mills, Rev. John, obituary of 743
Milner, Rev. Joseph, account of a publication of his 14
Milner's Reply to the Rev. Dr. Marsh, review of 609, 690
MILTON on Acts of Grace, 28. Books, ib. On Calvin, ib. On Catholic Faith, ib. On Roman Catholics, ib. On chaplains, 29. On charity, ib. On a national church, ib. On the clergy, 30. On the Common Prayer Book, 31. On conscience, ib. On royal conscience, ib. On the emperor Constantine, ib. On creeds ib. On civil and ecclesiastical functions, 114. On female society, ib. On the fathers, ib. On form of prayer, ib. Happiness of a people, 115. On heretic, ib. On irregularity, ib. On the divine law, ib. On liberty of conscience, ib. On liberty of person, ib. On popular preaching and pulpit training, 323. On petitioning, 388. On plain writing and preaching, ib On Paul, ib. Protestant persecution the worst of all, ib. On Mr. Prynn, 389. On reformation, ib. On reason, ib. On sectaries, ib. On Selden, ib. On the sabbath, 653. On schism, ib. On self-confidence, 655. On truth, ib. On toleration, ib. Not born a translator, 656. On the usurpation of kings, ib. On wives, 657

Mind, on the mode of its existence 736
Ministers, Unitarian, remarks on, 25. Mr. Taylor's remarks on, 184. Presbyterian, 185, 371. On Dissenting 366, 593, 762
Mirabeau, sentiment from 658
Miraculous cures by the corpse of St. Milburg 361
MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS, 11, 96, 172, 240, 294, 357, 442, 489, 579, 637, 706, 762
Miserable state of the Arabs 391
Misquotation from Mr. Aspland's correspondence with Mr. Webley 364
Mission of Mr. Wright in the north-west 55, 131, 249
Missions in India, intelligence on 216
Mitchell, Rev. Mr. his speech at Leicester 65
MOGGRIDGE, J. H. on the remaining funds of the Hackney College 180
Molanus on an union between the Catholic and Protestant churches 160
Mollahs of Turkey 634
Monasteries of the modern Greeks 436
Monks, modern Greek 437
Monthly Magazine, extract from 236
Monton, Unitarianism at 60
Monument of Henry VIII. at Windsor, plan of it 504
Monuments in Dissenting places of worship 365
More, Dr. Henry, his account of Socinians 16
More, Mrs. Hannah, and Hume 107
Morning Chronicle, extract from 776
Morris's Charta Religionum, review of 618
Moscow, destruction of the city, on Buonaparte's entering it 76, 691
Mosheim on the Ælian colony, 241, 296, 383, 450, 584, 723
Mosques, officers of the Turkish 635
Mother, a mourning 658
Motive for learning the catechism 390
Motives, on our obligation to act on scriptural, 103, 297, 650, 738, 765
Mourners, Greek 435
"Much good do you," Fuller on 455
Mufti of Turkey 633
Murder, reflections on 423, 623
Murray, Sir John, his conduct in Spain 488
Music, on the use of vocal and instrumental, in public worship, 41, 116, 460, 668
Musical taste 302
Musician, an Athanasian 327
Mysteries, remarks on 191

N.

N's Essay on the infinity of creation 11. On Hume and Mrs. Hannah More 107
N.'s review of Aspland's Vindication of Religious Liberty, 201. Sketch of the Life of Moses Mendelsshon, 221. On Lord Bolingbroke and Mr. Whitfield, 300. On an early Christian church at Rome, 397. Additional Contributions to Scriptural Criticism, 456. Essay on the Defects of the Reformation, 505. Review of Milner's Reply to the Rev. Dr. Marsh, 609. Essay on Protestant Nonconformity, 706. Strictures on a recent Publication of Mr. Palmer's, No. I. 715, No. II, 768. Review of Marsh's Reply to the Rev. Isaac Milner 787
Naibs of Turkey 634
Naish, Mrs. obituary of 346
Naked Gospel, account of it 786
Navy of America 213, 488
N. C. on the Quaker Doctrine of the Trinity, 109, 255, 306, 373, 644
Neal, Mr. on Dr. Watts's last sentiments 716, 721
Necessity of preaching against political immoralities, on the 379
Necessity, objections to the doctrine of, 513. R. H. on the objections to the doctrine of 777
Nelson's victory, H. Worthington's sermon on 569
Newcastle, Mr. Wright's preaching at 55
Newcome, Archbishop 490
Newdigate, Sir Roger 198
Newes of 1664, extract from it 95
Newton, Bishop, on the persecution of Christians 520
Newton, Sir Isaac, on his religious opinions 515
Niceas's wish 455
Nicholson the murderer 623
Nicolai, Frederick, account of 223
Niemen, the army of Buonaparte near the banks of 75, 284, 691
N. L. T. on the Versions of the 59th Psalm 637
Nonconformist Churches, a new Directory for 268
Nonconformity, Essay on Protestant 706
NO POPERY, speech of the Rev. J. Rowe at Bristol, 137. Speech intended to have been spoken by Dr. Estlin, 141. Counter-petition from Bristol, 143. Harlow Resolutions and Petition, 217.

Proceedings at Exeter, 218, 275 411
North of England, state of the dissenting interest there between 1750 and 1757 1
Northumberland, Duke of, Mr. Lindsey's connection with 50
Norwich, first annual meeting of the Eastern Unitarian Book Society at 541
Not born a Translator 656
No time in the grave 328
Nottingham Resolutions and Petition 135
Novel, reflections on a death bed extracted from one 101

O.

O. on the Genuineness of the Epistle to the Romans 193, 397, 399
Oaths prescribed to the Catholics 154. Held inviolate by the Catholics, 155. Taken by English Catholics 237. Taken by Irish Catholics 238
OBITUARY of, the Rev. John Atchison 277. Mr. John Coventry 278, 344. Mr. John Cross 619. Mr. Caleb Evans, 279. Mr. Joseph Jefferies Evans 123. Rev S. Girle 280. Rev. Jabez Hirons 52. Rev. John Jones 551, 639. Rev. W. Lord 347. Rev. John Mills 743. Mrs. Naish 346. Mr. C. C. Rotherham 347. Mrs. A Scott 129. Rev. W. Severn 550. Mrs. A. Smith 741. Mrs. Thomas 279 Mrs. E. Worthington 347. Rev. H. Worthington 545. Jeremiah Wrigley 54
Objections to the Unitarian Fund 319. To the Doctrine of Necessity 513 R. H. on 777
Obligation to study the Scriptures 103, 297, 650, 738, 764
Observations on Mr. Wakefield's Translation of Acts xx. 28, 392. Mr Jones's remarks on 466, 521, 595, 660, 663
Occasional Papers, Dr. Toulmin on 442
Octagon Chapel, Liverpool 626
Ode, criticism on the word 43
Oldbury Double Lecture 686
Oldham, Unitarianism at 60. Opening a place for Unitarianism worship at 535
Ὀλεθρος, on the meaning of the word 605
Opening a place for Unitarian Worship at Oldham 535
Opening of the Unitarian Chapel, Reading 744
Orange, Prince of 751
Orange-lodges in England, Duke of Sussex on 421
Orange-party in Holland 751
Oratory, Mr. Taylor's remarks on 184, 371
Ordination of the Rev. Henry Turner at Bradford 687
Origen on the Ebionites 240. Bishop Horsley's extract from, 295, 383, 453, 723. Mr. Jones's extract from 661. On the use of music in religious worship 670
ORIGINAL LETTERS, from the late Robert Robinson to the Rev. Mr. Gentleman 704. Of the late William Huntingdon to the Rev. Mr. Parsons 705
Orton, Mr. Job, on the anniversary of the Bartholomew sufferers 687
Osborn, his account of Elizabeth 309
OTIOSUS on Musical Taste 302. On the Religious Division of the world 448

P.

Paisley, Unitarianism at 538
PALMER, Rev. S. on the Bartholomew sufferers 687. His memoir of Dr. Ashworth 693. On the appellation "Socinian" 714. Strictures on a recent publication of 715, 768
Palmer's Dr. Watts no Socinian, review of 683. Strictures on 715, 768
Pampeluna, siege of 559, 692
Panadelphian Quakers, Dr. Walker on a Society of 509
Panagia of the modern Greeks 439
Papades of the modern Greeks 436
Papists, persecution of, in the reign of Elizabeth 732
Parable of the labourers in the vineyard, criticism on 458
Paradise, remarks on the word 528
Paraphrase on the Romans, Dr. Taylor's 3
——— on John i. 1—18, 792. On 1 Cor. x. 1 794
Parkman, Rev. F. on Unitarianism in America 479
Parliamentary Journal for 1660, extract from it 94
Parliaments, remarks on 70
Parsons, Rev. Mr. Huntingdon's letter to 705

Particular Baptists, their missionaries 789
Patmos, monasteries of 437
Patriarch of Constantinople 441. His power and revenue *ib.*
Patriotism true philanthropy 313
Patriot party in Holland 751
Paul, his appeal to Cæsar 388. His journey to Rome, criticism on 400
PEACE, proceedings at Leicester for 64. Petition from Warwick 73, 80. Nottingham Resolutions and Petition 135
Pekin, Europeans in 63
Penal Laws against the Unitarians 348
Penn, William 504. Anecdote of his conference with Charles II. 659
Percival, Thomas, the first student at the Warrington Academy 5
Persecution, Sketch of English Protestant 111, 308, 731
Person, Milton on liberty of 115
Petitions for peace, from Leicester 72. From Warwick 73, 80. From Nottingham 136. Counter, from Bristol 143. Mode of obtaining signatures to the No Popery 144. To obtain relief from subscription 197. The Harlow 218. From Exeter 220
Petitioning, Milton on 388
Peto, Father, his prophecy concerning Henry VIII. 504
Phædon, Mendelssohn's 223
Philadelphia, Unitarian Church at 349
Philanthropy, remarks on 313
Philemon on the Quaker Doctrine of the Trinity 373, 644
Philippians, criticism on 195
Philo on the Therapeutæ 460
Philos, Theological Queries of 246
Philo-Scotus, his inquiry concerning John Goldie of Kilmarnock 24
Philip, Mr. 301
Piddletown, Mr. Lindsey's residence at 59
Pierce, Mr. on Colossians 123, 460
Piteous and pitiful, on the proper application of the words 726
Pius V. his conduct towards Elizabeth 733
Pius VII. the present Pope, described 702
Placability of God, a moderate Calvinist on 247
Plain writing and speaking 388
Plan of the Warrington Academy 2. Of a General Association of Unitarians, remarks on 25. For a Society of Panadelphian Quakers 510
Planets, on their inhabitants 12
Platts, Mr. his complaint of the Evangelical Magazine 454
Platts on materialism, &c. review of 528
Plea for the Divinity of Christ, Mr. Belsham's account of it 18 256, 532
Plea for the Catholic Claims, Mr. Belsham's 409
Pliny, his letter to Trajan 461
Plomley, Mr. J. his account of the Rev. W. Lord 347
Plymouth, Mr. Jones's school at 552
POETRY, Eulogy to the memory of Granville Sharpe, Esq. 524. Elegy to the memory of Gov. Duncan 525. Love—from the German of Schiller 526
Poland, on the re establishment of the independence of 621, 692, 750
Politics, immoral, on the necessity of preaching against 379
Pope, his agreement with Buonaparte 146 Account of him and the court of Rome 696
Popery, Mr. Worthington's sermon on 564
Popular Preaching and Pulpit Training 323
Port Glasgow, Unitarianism at 538
Prayer, form of, for the Royal Touch, 9. (*note.*) 92. Of an Unbeliever 186. The New Directory on 269
Preacher's Directory, of Dr. Enfield 430
Preaching, Mr. Worthington's mode of 546, 563
Predestination, Dr. Marsh on 789
Prejudice, its effects exemplified 16
Presbyterian Congregations, on the decline of 183, 371
Presbyterian ministers in Lancashire, quarterly meeting of 61, 275 686
Present state of the Mahometan Religion in Turkey 630
Preston, Unitarianism at 58
Pretender, the, endowed with the power of touching for the evil 234
Pride, Colonel, anecdotes of 508
Priestley, Dr. anecdotes of him, 5. (*note.*) his controversy in the Theological Repository, 37 Controversy with Bishop Horsley, 173, 249, 294, 383, 450, 583, 723. His connection with the Warrington Academy 227

Priestley's Works, Gaius on a new edition of 317
Priests of the Greek Church, 434, 436, 438, 441. Not required in the duties of Mahometanism 635
PRIMITIVUS's observations on Mr. Wakefield's Translation of Acts xx. 28, 392. Mr. Jones on 466 See Dr. Lloyd
Prince Regent, his speech on opening the session of parliament 752
Princess Regent, see Princess of Wales.
Principles, moral, on the formation of 779
Prisons, Committee for examining the state of in 1653, 502
Proceedings at Exeter 218, 275
Progress of Moral Corruption, Mr. Worthington's Sermon 563, 568
Protestant, duties of one 505
Protestant Dissenting Ministers, their resolutions 274
Protestantism not greatly different from Catholicism 159
Protestant Nonconformity, Essay on 706
—— Persecution, Sketch of English 111, 308, 731
Protestant Persecution the worst of all 388
Protestants, Butler's Address to 149—161, 237
Protestant Society for the Protection of Religious Liberty 217, 274
Protestant union, remarks on it 145
PROUT, Mr. his account of the Methodist Excommunication at Flushing 301
Prussia, public affairs of, 77, 148, 212, 284, 356, 423, 487, 559, 621, 691, 749
Prussia, Queen of, her Answer to Father Vota 580
Prynn, Mr. Milton on 389
Ψαλλω, criticism on the word, 44, 116 460
Psalm, Criticism on the word 46
Psalms, Book of, Mendelssohn's Version 224. Criticism on 456. On the versions of the 59th, 637
Publications of Mr. Bealey 761
Punishment, Simpson's Essay on the duration of a future state of 603, 608. J. S. on Future 640. Mr. Sturch on 765. Remarks on the end of 779, 797
Pupils of Mr. Frankland 181
—— of Mr. Aikin at Kibworth 253
Puritan quotation, a happy 592

Q.

Quackery, royal 6, 91, 232
Quaker Doctrine of the Trinity 109, 255, 306, 373, 644
Quakers, Mr. Wakefield's reflection on 390. Panadelphian, Dr. Walker on a Society of 509
Quaker's Yearly Epistle 684
Quere by Te Tace 113, 454
Queries, theological 246
Questions respecting the Catholics proposed to the Foreign Universities 156

R.

R. on the cases of Thomas Aikenhead and Paul Best 108, 178. His account of the meeting of the subscribers to the Unitarian Academy 417
Radcliff's, Mr. account of Dr. Lardner 769
Ramazan, illuminations of the mosques at 635
Rapin on Elizabeth 733
Rationality, Milner's remarks on 15
Rayner, Mrs. account of her 342
Reading, opening of the Unitarian chapel at 744
Reason in religion, Milner's remarks on the use of 15
Reason, not sufficient for the guide of life 106. Mr. Sturch on the use of 299. Milton on 389. A. L. B. on the imperfection of 650, 738, 765
Recluses of Turkey 635
Rector Academiæ, on the office of 428
Reed, Mr. his ministry at Kirkstead 82
Rees, Rev. Mr. his speech at the Unitarian Fund 476. His sermon on the Principles of Protestant Dissent, review of 414
Reflections on a death-bed 101. Of Mr. Cappe on the miraculous birth of Christ 188
Reform, remarks on 520
Reformation, Milton on 389. Essay on the defects of it 585
Reformed Liturgy, Lindsey's 340
Regeneration, Manning's sermon on 405
Religion, state of, amongst the modern Greeks 433. Burns, the poet's, views of 519. Present state of the Mahometan in Turkey 630
Religious division of the world 448
Religious liberty in India 274
Religious penal laws 33
Remaining funds of the Hackney College 180
Remarks, general, of Mr. Wright on his tour in the North-west 131, 249
Repentance, on a death-bed 302
Reply of Mr. Belsham to "Ano-

ther Daventry Pupil" 96. To the Rev. H. Horsley 172, 240, 294, 383, 450, 583, 723. To Dr. Magee. To the inquirers after Christian truth 489. To the Rev. Isaac Milner, Marsh's, review of 787
Report of the Manchester New College 215. Of the Unitarian Fund 415
Resolutions, passed at Leicester for peace 71. At Nottingham 135. Of the Welsh Unitarian Meeting 214. The Harlow 217. Of the Dissenting Ministers of the three Denominations 274. Of the Unitarian Fund on the Trinity Bill 745. Of the Unitarian Society on ditto 746. Of the Kent and Sussex Unitarian Christian Association on ditto 747. Of the Southern Unitarian Society on ditto ib.
Restoration, universal, remarks on 605, 643
Resurrection, difficulties in the doctrine of 448. T. B. on 733
Retarder of the Abolition of the Slave-trade 638
Retreat of the French from Moscow 76. From Dresden 749
Revelations, criticisms on 124
Revenge, Christianity alone teaches it to be a crime 106. Mr. Sturch on 299, 650, 738, 766
REVIEW of, Aspland's Vindication of Religious Liberty 201. Barrett's sermon 268. Bealey's Discourses 613. Belsham's Memoirs of Lindsey 47, 197, 338, 529. Belsham's sermon on the Catholic Claims 409. Belsham's Thanksgiving Sermon 615. Carpenter's View of the Grounds of Dissent 206. Carpenter on the Proper Object of Religious Worship 413. The new Directory for Nonconformist Churches 268. Dobell's Vindication of Unitarianism 273. Dobell's Morning Visit ib. Drummond's Letters to a Dissenter 206. Eustace's Answer to the bishop of Lincoln's Charge 527. Evans's Letter on the Dissenting Ministers' Petition 342. Fox's Discourse on Unitarianism and Calvinism 618. Gandolphy's Letters to Dr. Marsh 205, 329. Hampson's Poetical Epistle to the Rev. J. Grundy 618. Horsley's Sermons 332. Hughes on the Titles and Attributes of God 273. Johns's Importance of the Scriptures 617 The Letter to Mr. William Cobbett 619. Lindsay's Sermon on the Influence of Religious Knowledge 412. Madge's Sermon on the Free Grace of God 343. Manning's Sermons 404. Marsh's Letter to Gandolphy 205. Marsh's Lectures, Part III. 673. Marsh's Reply to the Rev Isaac Milner 787. Milner's Reply to Dr. Marsh 609. Morris's Charta Religionum 618. Palmer's Dr. Watts no Socinian 683. Platts on Materialism &c. 528. A Protestant Dissenter on the Catholic Claims 411. A Protestant Layman's Letter to the Rev Mr. Thorpe 412. Rees's Sermon on the Principles of Protestant Dissent 414. The Remarks on the Bishop of Lincoln's Charge 616. Simeon's Excellency of the Liturgy 265. Simpson's Essays on the Language of Scripture 600, 677, 792. A Speech on the Catholic Question 616. Stacey's Remarks on the State of Man &c. 529. Toulmin's Letter to Freeston 204. Tremlett's Reflections 615. Turner's Sermon on the Minister's full Reward 414. Yates's Sermon on the Grounds of Unitarian Dissent 413
Revivalist, Mr. Wright's anecdotes of one 56
Rewards and Punishments, Simpson's Essay on a future state of 603, 606
Reynolds, Mr. account of him 49. His account of Mr. Lindsey ib.
R. G. S. his Sketch of English Protestant Persecution 111, 308, 731
R. H. on the Objections to the doctrine of Necessity 777
Rhemish Version of the Bible 351
Richard II. his practice of the royal touch 7
Richard III. his practice of the royal touch 8
Richards, his History of the Royal Touch 5, 91, 232
Riles, Mr. his proceedings at Flushing 301
Riots at Leicester, remarks on 64, 70
Risley, Mr. Wright's labours at 58
Ritùal of the Jews
Robertson, Dr., Dr. Toulmin

the biography of 442. His letter to the Bishop of Ferns 447
Robinson, Dr. R. Dr. Robertson's letter to 447
Robinson, Robert, Flower's Strictures on Mr. Belsham's account of him 17, 256. Remarks on his Plea 532. Original letter from to the Rev. Mr. Gentleman 704
Robinson, Robert, monument to his memory at Leicester 354
Robinson Crusoe, extract from 658
Rochdale, Unitarianism at 59
Rogers, Commodore 488
Roman Catholic, Milton on the absurdity of the term 28
Roman Catholics, their grievances 150, 237. See Catholics.
Romans, Epistle to the, criticism on 116. On the genuineness of it 193, 397, 399
Rome, an early Christian church at 397, 459. Account of the Pope and Court of 696
Romilly, Sir Samuel 141
Rotheram, Mr. C. C. obituary of 347
Rowe, Rev. J. his speech at the Bristol No Popery Meeting 137
Royal Bounty 391
R. S on a Family Bible 254
R. S. his obituary of Mrs. Naish 347
Ruin of Monarchs 328
Rules of the Methodist Society, remarks on 35
Russia, public affairs of 76, 148, 212, 284, 356, 423, 559, 621, 691, 749
Rutt, Mr. his account of a publication of the Rev. Joseph Milner's 14. His speech at the Unitarian Fund 474. On a calumny against the late Mr. Wakefield 776
Rycaut on Mahometanism 630
Ryley, Mr. John, his speech at Leicester 64

S.

Sabbath, Milton on the 653
Sabbaths, Manning on the Jewish and Christian 406
Sabellian, definition of the term 302
Sabrinus on the Methodist excommunication at Flushing 34
Saint makers of Greece 439
Salters' Hall, Mr. Worthington's pastoral duties at 547, 563
Santons of Turkey 637
Satan, Mr. Simpson's Essay on the word 678
Saville, Sir George, his speech 198
Saxon Dictionary, Manning's 405
Saxony, public affairs of 692, 749
——, King of 749, 750
Scheme of Scripture Divinity, Dr. Taylor's 88
Schism, Milton on 653
Schismatic, remarks on the word 507
Schleusner on the meaning of the words Αδω, Υμνεω, and Ψαλλω, 43, 130
School, of Dr. Aikin at Kibworth 164, 253. Difference between the discipline of an academy and 288. Of Mr. Jones at Plymouth 552
Schoolmasters, remarks on the duties of 763
Scotland, public affairs of 420. General Association of the Unitarians of 536
Scott, Mr. of Ipswich 4
—— Mrs. A. obituary of 129
——, Sir William 209, 282, 353
Scottish Blasphemy Act 17, 108, 178
Scripture, Mr. Cappe's remarks on the language of 40, 188. Importance of a correct translation 79. Dialogue on our obligation to study 103, 297, 650, 730, 764, 767
Scripture Divinity, Dr. Taylor's scheme of described 88
Scripture Doctrine of Atonement Dr. Taylor's 3
———— of Original Sin Dr. Taylor's 3
Scripture Language, Simpson's Essays on 600, 677, 792
Seckerson, Mr. A. query to him, on the Methodist excommunication at Flushing 36. His proceedings 301
Sectaries, Milton on 389
Seddon, Rev. John, his plan for the establishment of the Warrington Academy, 2, 231. Biography of 289, 427
Selden, Milton on 390
Selector on the Articles of the Church 373. On a Happy Puritan Quotation 592
Self-confidence, Milton on 655
Sellis, remarks on his death 210
Sermons, remarks on 250. Of Bishop Horsley, review of them 332. Manning's 404. Extract from an evangelical orthodox 500. Of Mr. Clayton 627
Severn, Rev. W. obituary of 550
Seyehs of Turkey 636
Sharpe, Granville, Esq. 145. Eulogy to his memory 524
Short hand, Mr. Worthington's progress in 569
Sidmouth, Lord, strictures on 21

Simeon, his excellency of the Liturgy, review of 265
Simpson's Essays on the Language of Scripture, review of 600, 677, 792
Sin, on the future punishment of 605, 641
Sinking fund, remarks on it 422
Sion, Henry the Eighth's body at 504
Sketch of English Protestant Persecution, Letter VI. 111. Letter VII. 308. Letter VIII. 731
Sketch of the Life, Writings and Character of Moses Mendelssohn 221
Slaves, barbarously treated by the Romans 593
Sleep, remarks on 735
Slichtingius on the use of music in public worship 121
Smalley, Rev. R. 753
Smith, John, Dr. Gregory's answer to 711, 780
Smith, Mrs. A. obituary of 741
Smith, W. Esq. his proceedings for the repeal of the penal laws against Unitarians 348. Letter from the Unitarians of Plymouth to 685. Thanks of the Unitarian Fund and Societies to him 746, 747, 748
Society for promoting the Knowledge of the Scriptures 531. For the Conversion of the Jews 644
Socinian, remarks on the word 683. Mr. Palmer on the appellation 714, 761
Socinianism, Milner's description of 15. Its similarity to Mahometanism 631
Socinians, Dr. Henry More's description of them 16
Socinian Tracts, enquiry concerning 14. Dr. Toulmin's account of them 443
Socinus, his confession of Faith 646. Remarks on 782
Socius's review of a New Directory for Nonconformist Churches 268
Somerset House, on the illumination of 486
Son of God, Mr. Cappe's remark on the term 193
Song, criticism on the word 43
Sophia Charlotte, Queen of Prussia, account of her 580
Soult, Marshal, his proceedings in Spain 559
Southern Unitarian Society, its Anniversary meeting 535. Its resolutions on the Trinity Bill 747
Sovereigns of England, their practice of the royal touch 7, 91, 232
Space, unbounded 12. Occupied in every part *ib.*
Spain, public affairs of 78, 148, 212, 283, 284, 355, 424, 487, 555, 559, 622, 692
Speaker of the House of Commons, his Speech to the throne 557
Speech on the Catholic Question, review of 616
Speeches at the Leicester meeting, of Mr. Ryley 64. Of the Rev. Mr. Mitchell 65. Of the Rev. Mr. Berry 68. Of the Rev. J. Rowe at Bristol 137. Intended to have been spoken by the Rev. Dr. Estlin 141. Of Sir George Saville 198. At the Unitarian Fund dinner 469. Of the Prince Regent on opening the session of parliament 752
Speed's Chronicle, extract from 504
Spilsbury, Rev. Francis 565
Spirit, Holy, Mr. Cappe on the scripture meaning of the term 38, 192. Dr. Watts on 772
Spiritual Supremacy of Christ 98
S. P. his addition to the list of pupils under Mr. Aikin 253. Obituary of the Rev. John Mills 748
Stacey, his Remarks on the state of man, &c. review of 529
Staffordshire, Mr. Wright's mission into 55
St. Alban's, Rev. Jabez Hiron's ministry at 52
Stapp, Mr. B. his connection with the Warrington Academy 288
Stars, probability of their being inhabited 12
STATE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, 75, 144, 207, 280, 350, 420 484, 554, 620, 688, 749
State of religion amongst the modern Greeks 433
St. Austin on John xvii. 3 783
Stephen, his address to Jesus 496
Sternhold and Hopkins, their version of the 59th Psalm 637
Stewart, his Collections, &c. extract from 17
St. Marculf, power of the royal touch derived from his relics 7
St. Milburg, miraculous cures by the corpse of 361
St. Nicholas, revelation to an Athenian woman from 440
Stock, Dr. on the Catholic claims 411
Stockport, Unitarianism at 57

Stockton Heath, anecdotes of a revivalist at 56
STONE, Rev. F. his Brief Account of the Rev. H. Taylor 285. Brief Account of the Rev. W. Hopkins 425
STREPHON, Mr. his letter to Mr. Wright on communion 31. Mr. Wright's answer to 252. Mr. Jennings on 591, 648
Strictures on Mr. Belsham's account of Robert Robinson 17, 256. On a recent publication of Mr. Palmer's. No. I. 715. Ditto No. II. 768
Strype on Queen Elizabeth 310
St. Sebastian, siege of 559. Capture of 622, 692
Stubbs, Rev. S. his library 86
Students, mode of admitting into Manchester New College 216. At the Manchester College, York 481
Studies, course of, adopted by Dr. Aikin 167. In Manchester New College 216. Pursued by Dr. Priestley 229
STURCH, Mr. on the Dialogue on the study of the Scriptures 297. Vindication of the Dialogue in reply to 650, 738. In reply to the Vindication 764
Subscription, petition to obtain relief from 197
Subscriptions to the Warrington Academy at its first establishment 2
Superstitions of the modern Greeks 438
Supremacy, spiritual, of Christ 98
Sweden, public affairs of 356, 424 487, 621
Synod of Constantinople 441

T.

T. his account of the Oldbury Double Lecture 686
Tactics, military, of the French 622
Tarvin, Mr. Wright's preaching at 56
Taunton, annual meeting of the Western Unitarian Society at 539
Taxes, observations on 422
Tayleur, Mr. his benefaction to Essex Street Chapel 530
Taylor, Dr. biography of 3. His ministry at Kirkstead 82. Proceedings at the Warrington Academy 87
TAYLOR, Mr. H. on the decline of Presbyterian Congregations 183, 371
Taylor, Rev. H. brief account of 285
Taylor, Mr. E. speech at the Unitarian Fund 470
T. P. on the Difficulties in the Doctrine of a Resurrection 734
Teeth extracted by the sect of Uveis 32
Temper should be kept though the argument be lost 27
Temple, Sir. W. on music 302
Tertullian on the use of music in religious worship 668
Test Act 150, 153
TE TACE, a quere by 113, 454
T. H. on the Genuineness of the Epistle to the Romans 399
Thanksgivings for victories, remarks on 554. For a plentiful harvest 688
Theological Queries 246
———— Repository, Dr. Priestley's controversy in 37
Theophylact on the power given to Christ 784
Θεος, criticism on the word 393 466, 522, 596. 670
Therapeutæ, Philo on the 460
THE SON OF A PRESBYTERIAN MINISTER on the decline of Presbyterian Congregations 185, 371
Thomas, Mrs. obituary of 279
Thornton on Mahometanism 633
Thorp, Mr. Dr. Stock's remarks on 411. A Protestant Layman's Letter to 412
Thurlow, Lord, anecdote of 176
Tiara of the Pope 696
Titles of the Socinian Tracts 444
Toland, his account of the Queen of Prussia 581
Toleration, Dr. Estlin's remarks on 143. Milton on 655
Tomkins, Mr. Martin, Dr. Watts's letter on his Hymns to 770
Tomlinson, Col. anecdotes of 503
Toncks, Rev. John 129, 220
Touch, the Royal, Richards's History of it 5, 91, 232, 368
TOULMIN, Dr. on the Biography of Dr. Robertson 442. On the Occasional Papers *ib.* On the Socinian Tracts 443, 541
———, his Letters to Freeston, review of 204
Tour, missionary, of Mr. Wright in the North-west 55, 131, 249

Towers's, Dr. account of the Queen of Prussia 581
Towgood, Mr. Dr. Benson's letter to 244
Tracts, Socinian, inquiry concerning 14. Dr. Toulmin's account of them 443
Tracts of the Unitarian Society 781
Translation of Griesbach's Note on Acts xx. 28 663—668
Treleaven, Mr. account of 302
Tremlett's Reflections, review of 615
Trinity, Dr Wallis's doctrine of the 51. Quaker doctrine of the 109, 255, 306, 573, 644
TRINITY BILL, remarks on it 484. Copy of it 543. Speeches on 545, 558, 616, 628. Resolutions of the Unitarian Fund on 745. Resolutions of the Unitarian Society on 746. Resolutions of the Kent and Sussex Unitarian Christian Association on 747. Resolutions of the Southern Unitarian Society on *ib.*
Tri-unitarians, remarks on them 485
Truth, Milton on 655
Tuition, Dr. Taylor's plan of 87. Dr Aikin's mode of 165. Dr. Priestley's mode 229
Turkey, present state of the Mahometan religion in 630
Turks, on their religion 630
Turner, Mr. his lectures on chemistry 578
Turner, Rev. Henry, ordination of 687
——, Rev. Wm. his address to the Students at the Manchester College, York 481
————, Mr. Lindsey's letter to him 200
—— his Sermon on the minister's full reward, review of 414
Tutor's Address to an Annual Meeting of his former pupils 517
Tutors of the Warrington Academy, memoirs of them 2, 86, 161, 227, 288, 427, 576, 625
Types, Dr. Marsh's lecture on 677

U.

Ulema of Turkey 633
Ὑμνεω, criticism on the word 43, 116
Unbeliever, prayer of one 186
Unbelievers, on the death beds of 32, 107
Uniformity, Act of 311, 706
Union of Knowlege and Goodness, Mr. Worthington's sermon on 567
Unitarian, remarks on the term 351. Dr. Bruce on the word 515. Remarks on the term 683, 715
Unitarian Academy, annual meeting of the subscribers to 417
Unitarian Associations, I. P. on 246
Unitarian Chapel, Reading, opening of it 744
Unitarian Church at Philadelphia 349
Unitarian Fund, objections to it 319. Its proceedings at the annual meeting 414, 468. Meeting on the repeal of the Trinity Bill 623. Resolutions on the Trinity Bill 745
Unitarianism, Mr Wright's account of in Lancashire and Cheshire 132, 249. Comforts of 182. In America 479 In Scotland 538
Unitarians, remarks on a General Association of 24. Fletcher's account of 36. On a General Association of 133
Unitarian Society, its Resolutions on the Trinity Bill 746
Unitarian Tract Society in Birmingham for Warwickshire, its annual meeting 636
United Provinces, see Holland
United States, public affairs of 78, 148, 212, 284, 424, 438, 559
Universal Unitarian Hymn 183
Universalist, remarks on 641. Daniel De Foe an 657
Universe, its infinity 11
Universities, Foreign, their answers respecting the Catholics 156
Upsal Codex 665
Urim and Thummin 682
Usurpations of Kings, Milton on 656
Uveis, followers of, drew all their teeth 632

V.

VERAX, his Answer to the Dissenting Minister's Complaint 593. Account of a retarder of the Abolition of the Slave Trade 638. M. H. on the Answer to the Dissenting Minister's Complaint by 762
Vermiculus, see BOOK-WORM
Versions of the 59th Psalm 637
V. F. his Historical Account of the Warrington Academy 1, 86, 161, 226, 287, 427, 576, 625. Account of a misquotation 364. Account of the ordination of the Rev Henry Turner 687
Vice, not chargeable to the Su-

preme Being on the doctrine of necessity 778
Victims of persecution 520
Vidal, Mr. 387
Vidler, Rev. W. his speech at the Unitarian Fund 474
Vindication of Religious Liberty, Aspland's 201
Vindication of the Dialogue on the Scriptures 650, 738. Mr. Sturch in Reply to 764
Vindication of the common Greek Text in Acts xx. 28 660
Visitor's address to the Students at the Manchester College, York 481
Vittoria, battle of 487, 554, 559
Vota, Father, his Letter to the Queen of Prussia 580. Account of him 582
Vocabulary, Dr. Taylor's Hebrew 87

W.

Wahaub, the Unitarian Chief 631
Wakefield, Mr. G. his account of Dr. Aikin 171. His translation of Acts xx. 28, observations on 392. Mr. Jones on 466, 496. Mr. Lloyd on 521. His connection with the Warrington Academy 579. On his translation of Acts xx. 28, 595, 660, 663. Mr. Rutt on a calumny against 776
Wakefield's Account of Ireland 390
Wales, Prince of, spiritualized 327
——, Princess of, discussion of the charges brought against her 211, 283
WALKER, Dr. on a Society of Panadelphian Quakers 509
Walker, Rev. George, his connection with the Warrington Academy 577
Wallis, Dr. his doctrine of the Trinity 51
Walmesley, Unitarianism at 58
Walpole, Horace, anecdote of his introduction to the Pope 697
Walsingham's account of Elizabeth 731
Walton's Polyglott 595
War, Mr. Mitchell's remarks on the effects of 65—69. Its effects on the British character 67, 71. Reflections on 620
Warner, his anecdote of Queen Elizabeth 309
Warrington, Unitarianism at 57, 132
Warrington Academy, Historical Account of the 1, 86, 161, 226, 287, 427, 576 625
Warwick petition for peace 73
Warwickshire Unitarian Tract Society Annual Meeting 536
W. A. his memoir of the Rev. Joseph Bealey 753
Watts, Dr. on the resurrection 449 On his last religious opinions 532, 683, 715—723, 768—776
Watts's Hymns, remarks on 770
Webley, Mr. Correspondence of Mr. Aspland with 364
Wellbeloved, Rev. Mr. his address at the ordination of the Rev. H. Turner 688
Wellington, Marquis of, his proceedings in Spain 78, 148, 356, 424, 487, 559, 622, 692
Welsh Unitarian Society, its meeting 214
Wesley, Rev. I. his remarks on Thomas Firmin 35
Wesleyans, their moderation 485
Western Unitarian Society, proceedings at its Annual Meeting 539
Westmoreland, Mr. Wright's missionary tour into 61
Wetstein on the Acts 664
Wheeler, Sir George 50
Whiston on the royal touch 234
Whitbread, Mr. his defence of the Princess of Wales 211
Whitehall, practice of the royal touch at 94, 232
Whitelock, extract from 109
Whitfield, Mr. and Lord Bolingbroke 300
Widows' Fund of the Presbyterian Ministers of Lancashire and Cheshire 758
Wilberforce, his Treatise, Mr. Belsham's review of 497
William of Malmsbury, his account of St. Milburga 363
Willoughby, Hugh Lord, of Parham 2
Wiltshire, discussion of the Catholic question in 145
Wiseman on the royal touch 236
Wives, Milton's remarks on 657
W. J. his account of the Manchester Quarterly Meeting 686
Wolverhampton, Mr. Wright's labours at 55
Wood, Alderman, his speech at the Unitarian Fund 472
Wood, Mr. outrage on 354
Wood's account of Dr. Gregory 710
Wood's sermons 250
Woolston, Mr. Bereus on 177
Wordsworth, Dr. on the Bible Society 329

Works of God, Manning's sermon on 407
Worlds, infinity of 13
Worship, public, on the use of vocal and instrumental music in 41, 116. Plan of, in the New Directory 271. On the use of music in 460, 668. A Hand Bill on national places of, at the West End of the Town 780. On the object of 782
Worthing, Mr. Worthington's death at 549, 572
Worthington, Mrs. E. obituary of 347
Worthington, Rev. Hugh, obituary of 545. Memoir of, by Mr. Joyce 561
Wright, Mr. Strephon's letter on communion to 31. His missionary tour in the North-West 55. 131. On an error in his Journal 249. To Mr. Strephon 252. His speech at the Unitarian Fund 470. On Evangelical Preaching in Reply to J. H. 588. Mr. Jennings on his letter on Free Communion 591. His answer 648
——— on Future Punishment, extracts from 641
Wrigley, Jeremiah, obituary of 54
W. S. [*Errat.* W. T.] his obituary of Mrs. A. Smith 741

X.

X. his Objections to the Doctrine of Necessity 513. R. H. on 777
X. X. A Seceder's objections to the Unitarian Fund 319

Y.

Y. his account of the annual meeting of the Western Unitarian Society 539
Yates, James, his Sermon on the Grounds of Unitarian Dissent, review of 413
York, Report of the Manchester College at 215, 480

AN

INDEX

OF THE

NAMES AND SIGNATURES OF CORRESPONDENTS.

*** As different Correspondents have often adopted the same signature, some ambiguity in the references will unavoidably arise; but this is an inconvenience necessarily attached to anonymous communications.

A.

A. 98
A. B. 255, 307, 525
A Bible Christian 178
A Constant Reader 32, 318
A Friend to Christian Union 24
A Friend to the Cause of Genuine Christianity 371
A Friend to Universal Liberty 33
A Lay Dissenter 379
A. L. B. 650, 738
A Lover of Justice 186
A Moderate Calvinist 247
Another Daventry Pupil 26
A Protestant Dissenter 366
Astley, Mr. R. 181
A Subscriber to the Improved Version 710

B.

B. 181
B. C. 704
Belsham Rev. T. 96, 172, 240, 294, 383, 450, 583, 723
Bereus 177
B. G. 535
Bicknell, Mr. 278
Bidellianus 17
Bruce, Dr. 515

C.

Cantabrigiensis 443
Cappe, Mrs. 37, 188
C. D. 306

E.

E. 418
E. B. 545
Editor 27, 64, 135, 149, 184 201, 425, 478, 489, 561, 762, 768
Episcopus 449
E. T. 541

F.

Filius Polonorum 14
Flower, Mr. 17, 256
Fordham, Mr. 377

G.

Gaius 317
G. H. 536
Gibbs, Mr. Silvanus 551
G. L. 550
Grundy, Rev. J. 478

H.

H. 347

I.

Ignotus 245
I. P. 246
I. W. 81, 245

J.

J. C. 589
Jennings, Mr. 591
J. F. 535
J. H. 249
J. H. B. 418, 536
J. I. 128, 590
Jones, Mr. John 466, 660
J. P. 542
J. S. 640
J. T. C. 196
J. T. E. 195

L.

L. C. 41, 116, 460, 619, 668
Little, Mr. 254
Liturgius 780
Lloyd, Dr. 392, 521, 595, 663

M.

Mann, Rev. Mr. 344
Maurice, Rev. Mr. 639
M. H. 101, 303, 365, 644, 762
Moggridge, J. H. 180

N.

N. 11, 107, 201, 221, 300, 397, 456, 505, 609, 706, 715, 768
N. C. 109
N. L. T. 637

O.

O. 193
Otiosus 202, 448

P.

Palmer, Rev. Mr. 687, 693, 714
Philemon 373, 644
Philos 244
Philo-Scotus 24
Platts, Mr. 454
Plomley, Mr. 347
Primitivus 392, 521, 595, 663
Prout, Mr. 301

R.

R. 108, 178, 417
R. G. S. 111, 308, 731
R. H. 777
R. S. 254, 347
Rutt, Mr. 14, 776

S.

Sabrinus 34
Selector 373, 592
Socius 268
S. P. 253, 743
Stone, Rev. F. 285, 425
Strephon, Mr. 31
Sturch, Mr. 297, 764

T.

T. 686
Taylor, Mr. H. 183
T. B. 734
Te Tace 113, 454
T. H. 399
The Son of a Presbyterian Minister 185
Toulmin, Dr. 442, 443, 541

V.

Verax 593, 638
Vermiculus 357, 502, 579, 710, 780
V. F. 1, 86, 161, 226, 287, 364, 427, 576, 625, 687

W.

W. A. 758
Walker, Mr. 509
W. J. 686
Wright, Mr. 55, 131, 249, 252, 470, 588, 648
W. T. 741

X.

X. 513, 777
X. X. a Seceder 319

Y.

Y. 539

A

TABLE OF TEXTS

EXPLAINED OR ILLUSTRATED.

BOOK.	CHAPTER.	VERSE.	PAGE.
GENESIS,	iii.		679
————	vi.	1—4	193
————	x.	2—4,	196
————	xii.	2,	682
————	xviii.	1,	783
————	——	14,	39
————	xli.	38,	38
Exodus,	vi.	3,	681
———	xxxi.	3,	38
———	xxxv.	31,	ib.
Numbers,	xxvii.	18,	ib.
Deut.	xv.	11,	338
Judges	iii.	10,	38
———	vi.	34,	ib.
———	xiii.	25,	ib.
———	xiv.	6,	ib.
1 Sam.	iii.	35,	604
———	x.	6,	38
———	x.	10,	ib.
———	xi.	6,	ib.
———	xix.	20, 23,	ib.
———	xvi.	13, 14,	39
1 Kings	xv.	29,	599
2 Kings	xvi.	9, compared with 2 Chron. xxviii. 20, 21	456
———	xviii.	16,	599
1 Chron.	xii.	18,	38
2 Chron.	xxviii.	20, 21,	456
Nehemiah	ix.	30,	39
Job	xiv.	1,	337
——	xxiv.	31,	599

BOOK.	CHAPTER.	VERSE.	PAGE.
Psalm	i.	3,	456
——	xviii.	49,	116
——	xxxiii.	1, 2,	465
——	li.	11,	39
——	lix.		637
——	lxxviii.	25,	681
——	cxxxix.	7,	39
Ecclesiastes	xii.	7,	334
Isaiah			793
——	vii.	14,	297
——	xl.	1, 3	793
——	xlviii.	16;	39
——	liii.	4,	682
Jerem.	xxiii.	6,	337
——	xxx.	19,	48
——	xxxvii.	4,	599
Ezek.	xi.	5, 24,	39
Daniel	iv.	8, 18,	38
——	v.	11—14,	ib.
——	vi.	3,	ib.
Hosea	vii.	2,	43
Micah	iii.	8,	38
——	v.	2,	468
Zech.	iii.	2,	678
——	vii.	12,	39
Malachi	iii.	1, 2,	332

MATT.	i. ii.	compared with Luke i. ii.	189
——	i.	20,	39
——	i.	23,	375
——	ii.	6,	468
——	iv.	7,	602
——	vii.	11,	39
——	x.	8,	457
——	—	10; compared with Luke x. 7, and 1 Tim. v. 18,	ib.
——	—	21,	458
——	—	34,	457
——	xv.	4,	682
——	xx.	9,	458
——	xxii.	43,	89
——	xxiv.	4, 5, 23, 24, 25	ib.
——	——	12,	335
——	xxv.	41,	678
——	——	46,	738
——	xxvi.	30,	124
——	xxviii.	18,	784
——	——	19,	375

BOOK.	CHAPTER.	VERSE.	PAGE.
Mark	iii.	21,	794
——	vii.	26,	334
——	ix.	43, 44,	738
——	xi.	22,	682
——	xii.	36,	39
——	xiii.	5, 6, 21—23	ib.
——	xiv.	26,	124
Luke	i. ii. compared with Matt. i. ii.		189
——	i.	28,	333
——	i.	28, 30, 35,	39
——	i.	35, 36, 37,	ib.
——	iii.		495
——	vii.	16,	793
——	x.	7,	457
——	xi.	13,	39
——	xii	51,	458
——	xx	42,	39
——	—	— xxiv. 41,	116
——	xxi	8,	39
——	xxiv	44, 45, 56,	794
John	i	1,	617
——	i	1, 2,	376
——	i	11,	333
——	i	1—18,	792
——	iii	5,	196
——	iv	35,	324
——	v	13,	193
——	v	20,	376
——	vi	62, 63,	681
——	viii	58,	793
——	x	18,	517
——	xi	25, 26,	334
——	xiii	27	39
——	xiv	6,	375
——	—	26,	796
——	—	30,	679
——	xvii	3,	783
——	xx	29,	335
Acts	i	8, 16, 20,	39
——	i	20, x ii. 33, xvi. 25,	116
——	ii	36,	333
——	iv	28,	127
——	v	41,	325
——	viii	14—25,	ib.
——	—	20	370
——	xiii	41,	665
——	xiv	21, 22, 23,	325
——	xv	19, 20,	402
——	—	36,	325
——	xvii	11,	617
——	xviii	6,	117
——	xix	21,	400
——	xx	28,	393, 466, 522, 596, 670
——	xxiv	14,	419
——	xxvi	18,	679
——	xxviii	11—29	403
——	—	17,	ib.
——	—	25,	40

BOOK.	CHAPTER.	VERSE.	PAGE.
Rom.	i	3,	516
—	i	3, 4,	375
—	i	8,	398, 403
—	i	20,	606
—	v	12—19,	679
—	viii	34,	497
—	ix	5,	376
—	—	9,	121
—	x	2,	536
—	xii	3,	195
—	xiii	1,	336
—	xiv	5,	202
—	xv	5,	400
—	—	9,	116
—	xvi.	3,	459
1 Cor.	iii.	17,	606
—	v.		649
—	viii	13,	603
—	x	3, 4,	794
—	—	31,	739
—	xi	13,	40
—	xiiii	1,	124
—	xiv	7, 15,	117
—	—	26,	119
—	xv	29,	794
2 Cor.	iv	4,	613
—	v	10,	336
—	vi	14—16	591, 648
—	viii	19,	325
—	xi	9,	459
Gal.	iv	4,	337
—	iv	14,	744
Eph.	i. 3, ii. 7, iii. 5. iv. 2, 17; v. 9, 18, vi. 5, 15, 18, 24,		122
—	i	4, 6,	516
—	ii	8,	537
—	iv	5,	480
—	iv	28,	455
—	iv	29,	459
—	v	19,	43, 45, 119, 121
Philipp.	i	14, iv. 14,	459
Col.	i	16, 17,	500
—	iii	16,	43, 119, 121
—	—	17,	739
1 Thess.	v	21,	655
—	v	25,	629
2 Thess.	ii	2,	195
1 Tim.	i	18,	794
—	ii	5,	375
—	iv	1,	39
—	v	18,	457
—	vi	13,	460
2 Tim.	iv	16,	399, 459
Phil.	ii	5—9,	195
—	ii	6,	781
—	iii	15,	655
Heb.	i	2,	793
—	ii	12,	123
—	iii	7, ix. 8,	40
—	vi	5,	604
—	vii	25,	497

BOOK.	CHAPTER.	VERSE.	PAGE
Heb.	xi	3,	794
——	—	11,	39
——	xii	2,	375
James	v	13,	123
1 Pet.	i	11,	796
——	i	18, 19, 20,	248
——	i	21,	375
——	v	2,	467
2 Pet.	i	4,	617
1 John	iii	3,	336
——	—	16,	668
——	iv	10,	248
——	v	7,	331, 490
——	v	20,	602
Rev.	ii	11,	605
——	v	8, 9, xiv. 2, 3, xv. 2, 3, xviii. 22,	124
——	v	9, xiv. 3, xv. 3,	43
——	xiii	8,	248
——	xx	14,	605
——	xxi	6	795

Just published, in 8vo. boards, price 4s. 6d. sold by Johnson and Co.
St. Paul's Church Yard,

A PLEA FOR UNITARIAN DISSENTERS.

A Letter of Expostulation to the Rev. H. H. Norris, M. A. on that Part of his late Work against the Hackney Auxiliary Bible Society which relates to Unitarians.

By ROBERT ASPLAND,
Pastor of the Unitarian Church, Hackney.

Speedily will be published, by the same Author,

A VINDICATION OF UNITARIANS AND UNITARIANISM. Two Sermons preached at Norwich, July 21st, and 22d, on Occasion of the Establishment of the Eastern Unitarian Book Society.

Of Messrs. Johnson and Co. St. Paul's Church Yard, may also be had, lately published, by the same Author,

1. A Selection of Psalms and Hymns for Unitarian Worship, 18mo. 5s. bound.

2. The same, in crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. bound.

N. B. A liberal allowance to Congregations taking 25 copies and upwards, (on application to the Editor.)

3. The Beneficial Influence of Christianity on the Character and Condition of the Female Sex. A Sermon on Behalf of the Widow's Fund, April 8, 1812. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

4. A Vindication of Religious Liberty. A Sermon before the Western Unitarian Society at Bridport. July 17, 1812. 12mo. 1s.

†‡† Of Messrs. Johnson and Co. may also be had, Mr. Edward Taylor's Collection of Psalm Tunes, accommodated to Mr. Aspland's Selection of Psalms and Hymns. 10s. 6d.

RULES

OF THE

UNITARIAN FUND,

ESTABLISHED 1806.

TO WHICH ARE ADDED,

A STATEMENT OF THE SOCIETY'S ACCOUNTS,

AND

A LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS,
&c. &c.

FOR 1812 AND 1813.

HACKNEY:
PRINTED BY C. STOWER, BROOKSBY'S WALK.

RULES

OF THE

UNITARIAN FUND,

ESTABLISHED MARCH 4, 1806.

It has long been a subject of complaint among Unitarians, and a topic of reproach to their adversaries, that so few active measures have been taken to diffuse among the lower classes of the people the doctrines of rational religion. A knowledge of this, together with a conviction of the necessary connexion between truth and righteousness, has prevailed upon a number of individuals, zealously concerned for the spread of scriptural Christianity, and the promotion of the happiness and improvement of the poor, to institute a society for the encouragement of popular preaching on Unitarian principles. The society is not insensible of the laudable efforts that have been made to instruct the public mind in the knowledge of pure

Christianity by the distribution of books. Those efforts its members have witnessed with pleasure, and have, as individuals, assisted. They are persuaded, however, that addresses from the pulpit are more suited to the habits of the poor, than addresses equally excellent from the press; and that the encouragement of Unitarian worship is one of the best means, as it is the natural consequence, of disseminating the Unitarian doctrine. Under this persuasion they have formed themselves into a society to be regulated according to the following rules:

I. This Society shall be denominated THE UNITARIAN FUND *for promoting Unitarianism by means of Popular Preaching.*

II. The uses to which the Fund raised by this Society shall be applied shall be,

First, to enable poor Unitarian congregations to carry on religious worship;

Secondly, to reimburse the travelling and other expenses of teachers who may contribute their labours to the preaching of the gospel on Unitarian principles; and,

Thirdly, to relieve those Christian ministers who, by embracing Unitarianism, subject themselves to poverty.

III. Every person subscribing the sum of Five Shillings or upwards annually, shall be entitled to recommend cases to the Fund.

IV. Every person subscribing the sum of One Guinea or upwards annually, shall be considered as a member of the Society, having a right to recommend cases, and to vote at all meetings, and to be eligible to all offices of the Society.

V. Every person subscribing the sum of Five Guineas or upwards at one time, shall be a member of the Society for life, having all the privileges described in Rule IV. of persons subscribing One Guinea or upwards annually.

VI. All subscriptions paid during any part of the year, shall be considered as commencing on the first day of January of the same year, and as terminating on the first day of January next ensuing. No subscriber shall be entitled to recommend a case, or to vote at any meeting, until his subscription for the current year be paid.

VII. There shall be a general annual meeting of the Society on the Wednesday in Whitsun-week, when a report shall be made of the state of the Society, and officers shall be elected for the ensuing year.

VIII. At the general meeting, a sermon shall be preached before the Society, by a minister previously appointed by the Committee, and a public collection shall be made for the benefit of the Fund.

IX. A Treasurer and Secretary shall be annually chosen at the general meeting; the Treasurer shall receive all subscriptions and make all necessary disbursements on account of the Society; the Secretary shall give notice of the meetings of the Society, record its minutes, and conduct its correspondence. Both the Treasurer and Secretary shall make a yearly report to the Society at its general meeting.

X. A Committee consisting of nine members (including the Treasurer and Secretary for the time being) resident in or near London shall be annually appointed at the general meeting, to manage the affairs of the Society, five of whom shall constitute a quorum, and three of the said Committee, viz. those three who, upon inspection of the Secretary's minutes, shall be found to have given the least attendance at Committee-meetings, shall be considered ineligible for one year.

XI. The Committee shall meet once a month, or oftener, if the Secretary shall think proper to call them together.

XII. Corresponding members shall be appointed by the Committee in different parts of the kingdom, to whom it shall be recommended to transmit to the Secretary an annual report of the state of Unitarianism in their several districts, to be laid before the general meeting, and otherwise to promote the general objects of the Society. Corresponding members shall be entitled to attend the Committee meetings in London, and shall be considered for the time being as members of the Committee.

XIII. Two members shall be chosen annually by the Society at its general meeting, as auditors of the Treasurer's accounts, one of whom shall never have been auditor before, by whom all the accounts shall be allowed and signed prior to their being submitted to the Society.

XIV. Every individual wishing to receive assistance as a preacher from the Unitarian Fund, shall produce ample testimonials to the Committee of his moral character and ministerial qualifications: and every congregation desirous of assistance from the Fund, shall produce a recommendation, signed by two or more subscribers, not members of such congregation.

XV. The Committee shall have the power of electing as honorary members such persons as by their advice and services shall render themselves particularly useful to the Society, who shall possess all the privileges of life subscribers, provided always that the Committee shall not elect more than two honorary members in one year, and that they specify in the Secretary's report at the yearly meeting the considerations on which such elections are made.

XVI. Ministers who may preach the annual sermon shall be honorary members of the society.

XVII. The Committee shall have the power in any emergency of calling an extraordinary general meeting of the Society.

XVIII. The above rules shall not be altered except at the general meeting. Any alterations intended to be proposed to the society, must be first notified to the Committee at one of its meetings; and no motion for altering the rules shall be carried unless by two-thirds of the members present at the general meeting.

Mr. JOHN CHRISTIE, 52, Mark Lane,
TREASURER.

Rev. ROBERT ASPLAND, Hackney Road,
SECRETARY.

COMMITTEE.

Mr. S. BARTON, Bishopsgate Street.
D. EATON, 187, High Holborn.
D. GIBBS, Grub Street.
W. HALL, Crosby Square.
S. HART, Paternoster Row, Spitalfields.
Rev. T. REES, Bernard's Inn.
Rev. W. VIDLER, West Ham.

AUDITORS.

Mr. L. ROWE, Brentford.
MR. W. STURCH, Stanhope Street.

COLLECTOR.

MR. JOHN MARSOM, High Holborn.

LIST

OF

MINISTERS

WHO HAVE PREACHED THE ANNUAL SERMON BEFORE THE SOCIETY.

1806* REV. JOSHUA TOULMIN, D. D.
1807 REV. ROBERT ASPLAND
1808* REV. JAMES LYONS
1809 REV. THOMAS REES
1810* REV. LANT CARPENTER, LL. D.
1811 REV. JOHN GRUNDY
1812 REV. WILLIAM SEVERN
1813† REV. EDMUND BUTCHER.

---

* Those ministers to whose names the asterisk is prefixed published their sermons.

† Mr. Butcher's Sermon is going to press.

TREASURER'S ACCOUNT.

Cash *Dr.*

1812.		£.	s.	d.
	To Balance from last Account	400	15	2
	To Collection at Parliament Court Chapel	12	6	2
	To Donations	18	6	0
	To Annual Subscriptions	199	10	6
	To Interest	15	0	0
		£.645	17	10

Contra *Cr.*

1812.		£.	s.	d.
	By Missionaries, in England, Scotland and Wales	182	13	0
	By Assistance to sundry Congregations	60	10	0
	By Books, Tracts and Printing	21	10	0
	By incidental Expences	30	18	9
	Balance	350	6	1
		£.645	17	10

SIGNED

WILLIAM FREND, }
LAWRENCE ROWE, } Auditors.

A LIST
OF
SUBSCRIBERS
TO THE
UNITARIAN FUND.

Those persons whose names are marked with ‡ are Subscribers of One Guinea or upwards per Annum; those with †, Members for life; with §§, Honorary Members; with ††, Corresponding Members; and those with || have presented Donations.

A.

‡ John Alderson, M. D. Hull

Mr. Alexander, Yarmouth

‡ Mr. James Alger, Minories

‡ Mr. R. Allchin, Maidstone

‡ Mr. Allen, Stratford, Essex

‡ Mr. George Allen, ditto

‡ Mr. Samuel Allen, ditto

Mr. William Amphlett, West Haddon, Northampton

Mr. R. Anderson, Lutton, Lincolnshire

|| Anonymous, Hackney

‡ Mr. Archer, Hertford

†|| Mrs. Arnold, Bridport, *deceased*

Mrs. Ashton, Thorne, Yorkshire

§§† Rev. Robert Aspland, Hackney Road

‡ Mr. Isaac Aspland, Wicken, Cambridgeshire

‡ Mr. F. Austin, Catsfield, Sussex

|| A. B.

‡ A. T. by Mr. Eaton

B.

‡ Mr. J. T. Bache, Bridgnorth
‡†† Mr. T. Badcock, Battle, Sussex
‡ Mr. James Bainbridge, Hackney
‡ Mr. W. Bakewell, Melbourn, Derbyshire
‡ J. F. Barham, Esq. Exeter
‡ Mr. Barnard, Harlow Mill, Essex
‡ Mr. W. Barnard, Harlow
Mr. William Barry, Paisley
Mr. Barth, Yarmouth
‡ Mr. Samuel Barton, Bishopsgate-street
‡ Rev. Edward Batten, Yeovil
Mr. Thomas Beaver, Boston, Lincolnshire
Mr. Bedford, Lincoln
† Mr. Thomas Bellerby, Oxford-street
‖‡ Rev. Thomas Belsham, Essex-street
§§ Rev. Ab. Bennett, Ditchling, Sussex
† John Bentley, Esq. Highbury Grove
‡ Mr. W. Bickerton, Bristol
‡ Robert Bicknell, Esq. James-street, Bedford-row
‡ E. Bicknell, Esq. Newington Butts
‡ Mr. J. H. Bidlake, jun. Homerton
‡ James Blackmore, Esq. Tenterden
‡ Mr. Thomas Blackmore, Tenterden
‡ Malachi Blake, M. D. Taunton
‡ Rev. W. Blake, Crewkherne
Mr. Boon, Thorne
Mr. H. Bowles, Yarmouth
Mr. Bowring, Hackney
‡ Mr. Charles Bowring, Elizabeth City, America
Mr. Edward Bowring, Wood-street
Mr. John Bowring, ditto
Mr. S. Boyd, Stainforth, near Thorne
‡ Mr. Bradley, Aldermanbury Postern

Rev. J. H. Bransby, Dudley
† Samuel Brent, Esq. Greenland Dock
‡ Mr. William Brent, Blackfriars Road
‖ Bridport (Congregation at, under the pastoral care of the Rev. T. Howe,) by Thos. Colfox, Esq.
‡ Mr. Christopher Briggs, Hull
‡ Mr. William Brooke, Lincoln
‡ Mr. Samuel Brookes, Willow-walk, Grange Road, Bermondsey
† Mr. Joshua Brookes, Mount Pleasant, on the Hudson, America
† Timothy Brown, Esq. Lombard-street
‡ Mr. James Browne, Ditchling, Sussex
Mrs. Brumfield, Friskney, Lincolnshire
† Rev. Joseph Bull, Hinckley
‡ Mr. Thomas Lever Burch, Aldgate
‡ Mr. Ephraim Burford, Stratford, Essex
‡ Mrs. Mary Burgess, Battle
† Mr. Burt
‡ Lady Burton
‡ Miss Burton
§§ Rev. Edmund Butcher, Sidmouth

C.

‡ C. C. by Mr. Freeman
†† Rev. Mr. Campbell, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
‡ Mrs. Cappe, York
§§† Rev. Lant Carpenter, LL. D. Exeter
Capt. Carr, Yarmouth
‖ Mr. Chaffin
‡ Mr. Thomas Chaldecot, Hackney
‖ Mr. Wm. Champion, Reading
Rev. Petei Charles, Evesham
† John Chatfield, Esq. Blackfriars Road
Mr. Chilley, Chatham

|| Christian Tract Society
†‡ John Christie, Esq. Mark Lane
‡ Mr. C. Claggett, Canterbury
†|| J. T. Clarke, Esq. Upper Brook-street
Mr. W. Clarke, Strand
‡ Mr. Richard Clout, Tenterden
Mr. S Cobb, Yarmouth
‡ Mr. Charles Cobb, Tudor-street, Blackfriars
‡ T. Cogan, M. D. Clapton
‡ Mr. W. B. Coleman, Battle
†|| T. Colfox, Esq. Bridport
‡ Mr. Edward Collinson, Homerton
‡ Mr. Richard Colvin, Stratford, Essex
|| Mr. J. Commins, Hackney
† Thomas Cooke, Esq. Isle of Wight
†‡ William Cooke, Esq. ditto
Mr. John English Cooke, Cuckfield, Sussex
‡ Mr. George Cooper, Cambridge Heath, Hackney Road
‡ Mr. Charles Corbould, Foster-lane
‡ Mr. John Cordy, Worlingworth, Suffolk
‡ Mr. J. Corn, Birmingham
‡ Rev. John Corrie, ditto
Mr. Charles Cox, Northiam
‡ Mr. Coveney, Tenterden
Mr. J. Crane, Wisbeach
||‡ Abr. Crompton, Esq. Chorley Hall, Lancashire
†|| Mr. John Cross, Exeter
‡ Mr. Crowe, Stockton
† Mrs. Sarah Crump, Tenterden
†† Rev. J. Cundill, Soham, Cambridgeshire
‡ Mr. Joseph Curtis, Hackney
‡ Mr. Stephen Curtis, ditto
Mr. Benjamin Cutforth, Thorp-Hall, Wainfleet

D.

Mr. Robert Darley, Thorne

‡ Rev. Job David, Swansea, *deceased*
‡ Mr. G. M. Davidson, Warmley House, near Bristol
‡ Mr. Davies, Corbet Court
†† Rev. T. Davies, Coed-y-Cymmer, near Merthyr Tydvil
Rev. H. Davies, Taunton
†† Rev. D. Davis, Neath, Glamorganshire
‡ Rev. Timothy Davis, Coventry
Mr. Thomas Dixon, Houndsditch
‡ Mr. Joseph Dobell, Cranbrook
‡ Mr. Samuel Dobell, ditto
‡ Mr. Edward Dodd, Dockhead
Mr. Nathaniel Drawbridge, Skames Hill, Sussex
‡ Mrs. Dreyer, Norwich
‡ Mr. J. Drover, Reading
Rev. T. Drummond, Ipswich
‖‖ Dundee Unitarian Society

E.

Mr. Abraham Easley
‡ Mr. David Eaton, High Holborn
Miss Mary Eades, Saffron Walden
‖‖ Edinburgh Unitarian Society
Mr. Thomas Elliot, Northiam
‡ Mr. Ellis, Northampton Place, Hackney Road
‡ Mr Ellis, Guildford
† James Esdaile, Esq. Bunhill Row
‡ Rev. Dr Estlin, Bristol
Rev. John Evans, Islington
† Rev. B. Evans, Stockton

F.

‖ Falkirk Unitarian Society
‡ W. Falla, Esq. Gateshead, Durham
‡ Mr. Fellowes, Nottingham
‡ Mr. W. Field, Canonbury

†‖ Thomas Fisher, Esq. Dorchester
† Mr. William Flower, Grove, Hackney
†‖ Mr. Matthew Flower, Walworth
†† Rev. J. W. Fox, Chichester
‡ Rev. S. Freeman, Forty Hill, Enfield
‡ Mr. Thomas Freeman, Dyer's Court, Aldermanbury
†‖ William Frend, Esq. Bridge-street, Blackfriars
‡ A Friend, by John Christie, Esq.
‡ A Friend, by Mr. Eaton
A Friend, Hull
‡ A Friend, Leicester
A Friend, by Mr. Gibbs
‡ A Friend, Stratford
A Friend, by Rev. Jacob Isaac.
‡ A Friend, by Mr. Keed, Lynn.
‡ A Friend, by Mr. Alexander
† An Unknown Friend
† John Fullagar, Esq. Newport, Isle of Wight

G.

† William Garfitt, Esq. Boston
‡ Mr. John Gaze, Norwich
‡ Mr. David Gibbs, Grub-street
‡ Mr. Thomas Gibson, Trump-street
‡ Rev. James Gilchrist, Worship Street
Rev. J. Gisburne, Trowbridge
‖ Glasgow Unitarian Church
‖ Glasgow Unitarian Fund
† Mr. Alderman Goodbehere, London
Mr. Benjamin Goodier, Unitarian Academy
‡ Mr. Goodwin, Red-Cross Court
‖ Mr. A Grey
Mr. Grice, Whitechapel-road
§§‡ Rev. John Grundy, Manchester

H.

‡ Mr. Thomas Haimes, Melbourn
‡ Mr. William Haimes, ditto
‡ Mr. William Hall, Crosby Square
Mr. T. Hall, South Summer Coates, Lincolnshire
‡ Rev. Mr. Hammond, Fenstanton, Huntingdonshire
‡ Mr. Hancock, Nottingham
Mr. William Hanson, Northiam
‡ Thomas Hardy, Esq. Walworth
‡ Mrs. Harries, Arscot, near Shrewsbury
‡ Mr. S. Hart, Paternoster-row, Spitalfields
‡ Rev. A. Harris, Maidstone
‡ Rev. Mr. Harrison, Manchester
‡ Mr. Harrison, ditto
† D. W. Harvey, Esq. Fearon House, Essex
† Mr. Thomas Hawes, Old Barge House, Blackfriars
† Mr. Benjamin Hawes, ditto
‡ Mr. W. Hawkes, Bishop Stortford, Essex
Mr. Hazard, Yarmouth
Mr. Joseph Heald, Hackney
‡ Mr. W. Hebert, Poultry
Rev. N. T. Heinekin, Gainsborough
‡ Mr. James Hennell, Hackney
† J. P. Heywood, Esq. Wakefield
Mr. Hickes, Old Ford
‡ Rev. E. Higginson, Derby
|| Mr. Hine
|| Mr. Hippius, Hackney
‡ Jona Hobson, Esq. Liverpool
†‡ Joseph Holden, Esq. Brighton
† Mr. Joseph Holden, jun. ditto
† Rev. Lawrence Holden, Tenterden, Kent
‡ Rev. J. Holland, Bolton, Lancashire

‡ Rev. James Holt, Cirencester
‡ Mr. W. Hopkins, jun. Kidderminster
Mr. Andrew Hopkins, Barnbydoon, Yorkshire
|| Horncastle, Unitarians at
‡ Rev. T. Howe, Bridport
†|| Mrs. Mary Hughes, Hanwood, near Shrewsbury
||‡ Mrs. Ann Hughes, ditto
‡ Mr. Hunt, Lawrence Poulteney Hill
‡ Mr. Hursthouse, Tydd, Lincolnshire
Mrs. Husband, Thorne, Yorkshire

I. J.

‡ Mr. J. Jacks, Grove Hill, Camberwell
† Samuel Jackson, Esq. Manchester
‡ Mr. Michael Jackson, Lynn
‡ Mr. Thomas Jacobs, Taunton
‡ Mr. E. Jacobs, Sheerness
‡ T. H. Janson, Esq. Clapton
Mr. J. Jecks, Wisbeach
‡ Mr. T. Jecks, Sewardstone
‡ Edward Jeffries, Esq. Terhill, near Taunton
Rev. John Jeffery, Billingshurst, Sussex
|| Mr. W. Jennings
‡ Rev. W. Johns, Manchester
†‡ Ebenezer Johnston, Esq. Lewes
‡ Mr. William Johnson, Stratford
† John Geere Jones Esq. Mark Lane
‡ Rev. D. Jones, Nantwich
‡ Rev. J. Jones, Great Coram-street
Rev. Evan Jones, Duffield, Derbyshire
‡ Mr. Hugh Jones, Gracechurch-street
† Rev. Jer. Joyce, Highgate
‡ Miss Iremonger, Upper Grosvenor-street
Rev. Jacob Isaac, Moreton Hampstead, Devonshire

K.

‡ Mr. James Keed, Lynn
† W. B. Kennaway, Esq. Exeter
Rev. John Kenrick, York
‖ Rev. John Kentish, Birmingham
‡ Mrs. Kenward, Battle
‡ Mr. D. Key, Free School-street, Horsleydown
‖‡ Sampson Kingsford, Esq. Sturry, near Canterbury
‡ Mr. William Kingsford, Dover
‡ Rev. L. Kirby, Lutton, Lincolnshire
‡ Mr. Richard Knight, Foster-lane

L.

‖ L. M. S.
‡ Mr. Thomas Lacy, Crescent Place, Tavistock Square
† R. M. Leake, Esq. Guildford-street
‡ Mr. A. Lean, Fenchurch-street
‡ Mr. J. H. Lean, ditto
Mr. Richard Lee, Stainforth, near Thorne
Mr. Thomas Lettis, Jun. Yarmouth
‡ Mr. T. Lewis, Queen-street, Cheapside
† George Lewis, Esq. Little Knightrider-street
† John Lovewell, Esq. Putney
‡ Mr. Luntley, Shoreditch
‡ Mr. Robert Lyon, Clapton
§§ Rev. James Lyons, Chester

M.

† Mr. Mace, Tenterden
† Mr. John Mace, ditto
† Mr. Joseph Mace, ditto
‡ Mr. John M'Arthur, Mark-lane
‡ Rev T. Madge, Norwich
‡ Mr. Edward M'Guire, Stratford
‡ Mr. William M'Guire, ditto
‡ Mr. John M'Guire, ditto
‡ E. L. Macmurdo, Esq. Clapton
‡ W. O. Manning, Esq.

‡ Mr. John Marsden, Stainforth, near Thorne
Mrs. Marsh, Chatham
‡ Rev. John Marsom, High Holborn
Rev. B Marten, Dover
‡ Mr. Samuel Martin, Hull
‡ Mr. Edward Martin, Tansor, Northamptonshire
† Peter Martineau, Esq. Dulwich-hill, Camberwell
‡ Mr. Thomas Maylin, Billericay, Essex
‡ Mr. Meares, Hackney
Mr. W. Metcalf, Battle
Mr. Francis Metcalfe, Rolvenden
†‖ Mrs. Meyer, Enfield
‡ Miss Middleton, St. Martin's-lane
‡ Mr. Jesse Middleton, ditto
‡ Mr. Robert Millar, Dundee
Mr. Francis Moat, Fishlake, near Thorne
‡ Mr. J. Montgomrey, Brentford
‖ Moreton Hampstead Congregation, by Rev. J. Isaac
Mr. T. Morris, Hatfield, Yorkshire
†‖ Mr. W. H. Mortimer, Fleet-street
† Mr. John Munn, Rolvenden

N.

Mr. T. Naish, Poole
‡ Mr. W. Neve, Battle
‡ Mr. W. Newson, Norwich
‡ Mr. Benjamin Newton, Tuffnel-place, Islington
† Mr. J. Nightingale
†‖ Mrs. Norman, Charlotte-street, Bedford-square
‡ Perceval North, Esq. New Bridge-street, Blackfriars

O.

‡ O.
Mr. J. Odlin, Boston, Lincolnshire
†† Rev. D. Oliver, Gellionnen, Glamorganshire
Mr. B. Oliver, Ludney, Lincolnshire
Mr. B. Oliver, jun. Theedlethorpe, ditto

Mr. W. Osborn, March Chappel, ditto
‡ Mr. Philip Ovenden, Tenterden

P.

‡ P. W. by Mr. Freeman
‡ Mr. Thomas Pargeter, Stourbridge
‡ Mr. Parker, Westminster
‡ Mr. Samuel Parkes, Goswell-street
‖‡ John Parsons, Esq. Upland House, Bridgewater
‡ Mr. D. Parsons, Dudley
Mr. Pashley, by Rev. Jos. Bull
‡ Mr. R. Pass, Boston, Lincolnshire
† Mr. R. Pawsey, Bury St. Edmunds
Mr. Thomas Payne, Burwash, Sussex
Mr. J. Peach, Derby
† John Pearson, Esq. Rutland Wharf, Thames-street
Mr. J. E. Pethurst, Cranbrook
† S. Pett, M. D. Clapton
‖ Mr. Richard Peyton, Birmingham
†† Rev. Benjamin Phillips, St. Clear's, Carmarthenshire
‖ Rev. Mr. Philpot, Saffron Walden
†‖ Mrs. Dorcas Phipps, by Rev. J. Rowe
† James Pickburne, Esq. Hackney
‡ Mr. Pierce, Milk-street
‡ Mr. Thomas Pine, Maidstone
Miss Pine, Chatham
‡ John Pinkerton, Esq. Edmonton, *deceased*
† Rev. H. H. Piper, Norton, Derbyshire
‡ Mr. Alexander Plimpton, Battersea Fields
‡ George Plomer, Esq. Essex-court, Temple
†† Rev. J. Platts, Boston, Lincolnshire
††‡ Mr. John Plomley, Northiam, Sussex
‡ Mr. W. Plomley, ditto
‡ Mr. Stephen Ponder, East Cheap
‡ Mr. W. Porter, Islington
‖ Samuel Prime, Esq. Upper Brook-street, Grosvenor-square, *deceased*

†† Mr. Thomas Prout, Flushing, Cornwall
‡ Rev. R. Pyall, Cranbrook
‡ Mr. Purden, Glasgow

R.

‡ Mr. Richard Rankin, 'Change-alley
Mr. S. W. Ray, Liverpool
§§‡ Rev. Thomas Rees, Barnard's Inn
Rev. Jenkins Rees, Coed-y-Cymmer
†‖ Richard Reynolds Esq. Paxton, Huntingdonshire
Rev. William Richards, Lynn
‡ Christopher Richmond, Esq. Temple
‡ Mr. John Roberts, Lutton, Lincolnshire
‡ Edw. Robinson, Esq. Friday-hill, near Woodford
†‡ Mr. Thomas Robinson, Melbourn
Mr. Richard Robinson, Hull
Mr. William Robinson, Liverpool
Mr. John Rodford, Hull
Miss Rogers, Birmingham
† Mr. F. Ronalds, Thames-street
‡ Mr. E. Ronalds, ditto
‡ Mr. J. Ross, Glasgow
Mr. John Roswell, Pitfield-street, Hoxton
‡ Mr. Lawrence Rowe, Brentford
‡ Mr. T. B. Rowe, Brentford
† Rev. J. Rowe, Bristol
‡ Mr. J. Rowland, Boston, Lincolnshire
† John Towill Rutt, Esq. Bromley

S.

† Mr. Thomas Samson, Tenterden
† Mr. Benjamin Samson, ditto
‡ T. B. W. Sanderson, Esq. Chewbent
‡ Mr. Sandford, Bishopsgate-street
‡ Mrs. Scandeman, Canterbury
† Mrs. Scott, Birmingham, *deceased*
Mrs. Searson, Throne
Mr. Benjamin Seaton, Chatham

Mr. Joseph Seaton, Chatham
‡ Rev. R. Seaward, Poole
† Senex Cornubiensis
§§‡ Rev. W. Severn, Hull
‡ Mrs. Shaw, Hackney
‡ Rev. W. Shepherd, Gateacre
‡ Mr. Joseph Sheppard, Frome, Somersetshire
† Mr. John Shipley, Great St. Helens
† Samuel Shore, Esq. Meersbrook, Yorkshire
† Samuel Shore, jun. Esq. Norton-hall, Derbyshire
† G. Shute, Esq. Crediton, Devon
Mr. Seddon, Mansfield
‡ Mr. Thomas Simons, Walworth
‡ Mr. Martin Simpson, Stainforth, near Thorne
† Joseph Kirkpatrick Silver, Esq. Bedford-street
† William Skirrow, Esq. Borough
‡ Mr. N. Slatter, Battle
Mr. W. Slatter, ditto
Mrs. Sarah Slatter, jun. ditto
Mr. G. Slatter, ditto
† Rev. G. Smallfield, Homerton
‡ Rev. R. Smethurst, Stand, near Manchester
‡ Mr. William Smith, King-street, Snow-hill
‡ Mr. Samuel Smith, Fenchurch-street
Mr. Edward Smith, Birmingham
Mr. David Smith, Cloth-fair
‡ Thomas Solly, Esq. Clapton
‖ Southern Unitarian Society
‡ Mr. George Southey, Hampstead
† Mr. John Sowerby, Cheapside
‡ Mr. Joseph Spurrell, Hackney
‡ Mr. Spyring, Borough
‡ Mr. William Stanger, Fleet, Lincolnshire
† Mr. Benjamin Staley, Camberwell
‡ Mr. James Stead

‡ Mr. Robert Stevens, Hackney
†† Rev. J. Steward, Wolverhampton
‡ Mr. Caleb Stower, Homerton
‡ S. S. Strong, Esq. Poole
‖ Mr. William Sturch, Stanhope-street, Clare-market
‡ Mr. Surridge
‡ Mr. Edward Swan, Earsdon-hill, Northumberland

T.

Mr. W. Tharret, Grainthorpe, Lincolnshire
Rev. James Tayler, Nottingham
† James Taylor, Esq. Philadelphia
† H. W. Taylor
‡ Mr. David Taylor, Finsbury-square
‡ Mr. Richard Taylor, Shoe-lane
‡ Mr. John Taylor, Stratford
Mr. Edward Taylor, Norwich
Mr. W. Thicket, Thorne, Yorkshire
‡ Mr. Edward Thompson, Hull
‡ Mr. John Thompson, ditto
Mr. William Thompson, ditto
‡ Mr. John Thornton, ditto
‡ Mr. John Thurston, ditto
‡ Mr. W. Titford, Union-street, Bishopsgate
‡ Mr. Richard Titford, ditto
‡ Mr. W. J. Titford, Jamaica
† John Todhunter, Esq. Homerton
Mr. C. D. Tolme, Yarmouth
Rev. S. S. Toms, Framlingham
§§ Rev. Joshua Toulmin, D. D. Birmingham
† Rev. J. L. Towers, Windsor-terrace, City-road
‡ Mr. John Townend, Shoreditch
Mr. John Treacher, Paternoster-row
‡ Mr. John Tribe, jun. Chatham
‡ Rev. William Turner, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Mr. Weston Tuxford, Boston, Lincolnshire
A. T. by M. Eaton

U. V.

|| Unitarian Society
‡ Mr. W. Venning
§§ Rev. W. Vidler, West Ham
†† Mr. Thomas Vine, Brighton

W.

†‡ Robert Wainewright, Esq. Gray's-Inn
‡ John Waldron, Esq. Trowbridge
‡ Mr. Daniel Walker, Rochdale
‡ Timothy Wallington, Esq. Ilminster
‡ Henry Wansey, Esq. Bath
‡ Mrs. Wansey, Warminster
|| Warrington, Unitarian Congregation at, under the Pastoral Care of Rev. W. Broadbent.
‡ Mrs. Warter, Cruck Meole, Salop
Mr. Watts, Gainsford-street, Horsleydown
‡ Mr. John Watson, Holborn-hill
Mr. Watson, Hull
‡ Mr. John Watson, Aldgate
‡ Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, York
‡ Miss Mary Weller, Battle
|| Western Unitarian Society
Mr. Westfall, Stratford, Essex
|| Mark White, Esq.
‡ Mr. Wilkinson, Fenchurch-street
Mr. John Wilkinson, Paisley
‡ Mr. Roger Williams, Vine-yard, Tooley-street
‡ Mrs. Wise, Chatham
† Mr. Alderman Wood, London
‡ John Wood, Esq. Lewes
|| Mr. Peter Wood, Croydon, Surry
‡ Mr. John Wood, Hackney
‡ Ottiwell Wood, Esq. Liverpool
‡ George Wood, Esq. Manchester

Rev. J. Worsley, Plymouth
Mr. Thomas Wren, Catsfield, Sussex
Mr. E. Wren, Battle
§§ Rev. Richard Wright, Wisbeach, Cambridgeshire
Mr. F. B. Wright, Liverpool
Mr. Jer. Wrigley, Thorne

Y.

†‖‖‖ Rev. John Yates, Liverpool
†† Rev. James Yates Glasgow
‡ James Young, Esq. Hackney

⁂ *Subscriptions and Donations are received by the Treasurer, Committee, and all the Corresponding Members of the Fund, of whom also information may be had of the Rules and Proceedings of the Society.*

THE FOLLOWING GENTLEMEN IN THE COUNTRY HAVE KINDLY CONSENTED TO RECEIVE SUBSCRIPTIONS ON ACCOUNT OF THE SOCIETY.

B.

Bath, Rev. Jos. Hunter
Birmingham, Rev. Dr. Toulmin
——— Rev. John Kentish
Boston, Rev. J. Platts
Bolton, Rev. J. Holland
Bridgewater, John Parsons, Esq.
Bridport, Rev. T. Howe
——— T. Colfox, Esq.
Brighton, Joseph Holden, Esq.
Bristol, Rev. Dr. Estlin
——— Rev. J. Rowe
Bury, (Lanc.) Rev. W. Allard
Bury St. Eds. Rev. W. P. Scargill

C.

Canterbury, S. Kingsford, Esq.
Chester, Rev. J. Lyons
Chichester, Rev. W. J. Fox
Chorley, (Lanc.) Rev. W. Tate
Chowbent, (Lanc.) T. B. W. Sanderson, Esq.
Cirencester, Rev. J. Holt
Cockey-moor, (Lanc.) Rev. Joseph Bealey
Collumpton, Rev. Mr. Davis
Coventry, Rev. T. Davis
Crewkerne, Rev. W. Blake

D.

Derby, Rev. E. Higginson
Ditchling, (Suss.) Rev. A. Bennett
Dorchester, Thos. Fisher, Esq.
Dover, Rev. B. Marten

Dudley, Rev. J. H. Bransby
Dundee, Mr. Robert Millar

E.

Edinburgh, Mr. James Fortune
Evesham, Rev. P. Charles
Exeter, Rev. Dr. Carpenter
——— John Cross, Esq.

F.

Flushing, Mr. Prout
Framlingham, Rev. S. S. Toms

G.

Gainsborough, Rev. N. T. Heinekin
Gateacre (Lanc.) Rev. W. Shepherd
Glasgow, Rev. J. Yates
Gloucester, Rev. R. Aubrey

H.

Hinckley, Rev. J. B. Bristowe
Hull, Rev. W. Severn

I.

Ilminster, Rev. J. Evans
Ipswich, Rev. T. Drummond

K.

Kendal, Rev. J. Harrison

L.

Lambrook, (Som.) Rev. T. Davis
Leicester, Rev. C. Berry
Lewes, Eb. Johnston, Esq.
Lincoln, Rev. Mr. Harrison
Liverpool, Rev. J. Yates
——— Rev. R. Lewin
Lloyd Jack, (Cardigan) Rev. John James
Lutton (Linc.) Rev. L. Kirby
Lynn, Mr. James Keed

M.

Maidstone, Rev. A. Harris

Manchester, Rev. J. Grundy
——— Rev. W. Johns
———Rob. Phillips, Esq.
Mansfield, (Notts.) Rev. J. Williams
Moreton-Hampstead, Rev. J. Isaac

N.

Nantwich, Rev. D. Jones
Neath, Rev. D. Davis
Newcastle upon Tyne, Rev. W. Turner
Newport, (I. W.) Thos. Cooke, Esq.
Norwich, Rev. T. Madge
——— Rev. Isaac Perry
——— Mr. Edward Taylor
Nottingham, Rev. James Tayler
———Rev. R. Fry

O.

Oldbury, (Staff.) Rev. T. Davis
Ormskirk, Rev. Mr. Fogg

P.

Paisley, Mr. Robert Boag
Plymouth, Rev. I. Worsley, Mr. Curtis
Poole, Rev. R. Seaward
Portsmouth, Rev. R. Scott

R.

Reading, Mr. Drover
Rochdale, Rev. W. Hassal
Rolvenden, (Kent) John Munn, Esq.

S.

Saffron Walden, Rev. S. Philpot
Sheffield, Rev. Dr. N. Phillips
Shrewsbury, Rev. Mr. Case
Sidmouth, Rev. Ed. Butcher
St. Clears, (Car). Rev. B. Phillips
Stockport, Rev. S. Parker
Stockton, T. Crowe, Esq.

T,

Taunton, Rev. H. Davies
Tavistock, Rev. W. Evans
Tenterden, Rev. L. Holden
Trowbridge, Rev. J. Gisburne
Tydd, (Linc.) Charles Hursthouse, Esq.

W.

Wakefield, Rev. T. Johnstone
Warminster, Rev. G. Roberts
Warrington, Rev. W. Broadbent
————W. Smith, Esq.
Wem, (Shrop.) Rev. W. Hazlitt
Wisbeach, Rev. R. Wright
————Mr. Jecks
Wolverhampton, Mr. J. Pearson

Y.

Yarmouth, (Great) Mr. W. Alexander
Yeovil, Rev. S. Fawcett
York, Rev. C. Wellbeloved

*** Any mistakes in the foregoing Lists will be cheerfully corrected in the next Lists of Subscribers and Receivers.

3)

Sermons preached before the Society.

1. Popular Preaching recommended by the Conduct of Christ as a Teacher. By Joshua Toulmin, D. D. 12mo. 1s. Johnson. 1806, 7.

2: The Dissemination of Unitarian Principles recommended and enforced. By James Lyons. 8vo. 1s. 6d. 12mo. 1s. Eaton. 1808.

3. On the Importance and Dissemination of the Doctrine of the proper Unity of God. By Lant Carpenter, LL. D. 12mo. 1s. Eaton.

A few copies of the Reports may be had of David Eaton, 187, High Holborn; viz.

Second Report, 1806,	(12mo.)	6d.
Third Report, 1807,	(do.)	1s.
Fourth Report, 1808,	(do.)	1s.

*** The above were the only Reports published. The Second Report was stitched up with some of the copies of Dr. Toulmin's Sermon.

[illegible]

---

1. [illegible] D.D. [illegible]

2. [illegible]

3. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

BINDING LIST AUG 1 1935

313523

Author P LE.C.lit.

Title Monthly repository, 8,1813 M

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED